

GCSE

Drama

General Certificate of Secondary Education **J315**

OCR Report to Centres June 2016

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this report.

© OCR 2016

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education Drama (J315)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
A581 From Page to Stage	4
A582 Drama in the Making	7
A583 From Concept to Creation	12

A581 From Page to Stage

General Comments

The majority of centres collated the required sample with due care and a very good understanding of the moderator's requirements. Such centres ensured that a copy of the MS1 was sent to OCR before the deadline date and that a CAF and a further copy of the MS1 or a copy of the electronically transferred final marks were sent to the moderator. The copy of the moderator's MS1 is essential in enabling the moderator to cross check marks and highlight any clerical errors. Model centres completed in detail the Centre Assessment Forms including highlighting the inner printed Performance Marking Criteria for A01, A02 and A03. Such information combined with the detailed annotation of the Working Records allowed the moderator to understand 'how' and 'why' marks had been awarded.

A well chaptered DVD with supporting 'Running Order Sheet' enabled moderators to locate candidates for moderation with ease. Those centres which encouraged candidates to give their name and candidate number slowly and clearly to camera ensured that the identification of candidates was easily accessible. Of late many centres have also encouraged candidates to hold a placard with their name and candidate number clearly printed, this process was highly commended by moderators. It is worth remembering that the centre knows their candidates well, the moderator does not.

The most successful filming was achieved when the camera had been placed in a static central position which took in all of the performance space. Such successful filming was further enhanced when the stage lighting and sound recording enabled all the candidates to be seen and heard throughout their performances. Whilst 'close ups' enabled the nuances of facial expression and gesture to be observed this should not detract from the actions of other candidates within the same space.

A well prepared and easily accessible DVD allowed the moderator to identify and track candidates throughout their performance with ease.

Texts

This year as well as the 'old favourites' such as Blood Brothers and the works of John Godber moderators were pleased to see some centres engaging candidates with a range of differing texts including:-

We Lost Elijah	Ryan Craig
Dr Korczak's Example	Benjamin Zephaniah adapted by Lemn Sissay
The Dumb Waiter	Harold Pinter
Oh What a Lovely War	Joan Littlewood
45 Minutes	Anya Reiss
Equus	Peter Shaffer
The Tempest	William Shakespeare
DNA	Dennis Kelly
The Curious Incident of a Dog in the Night-time	Mark Haddon adapted by Simon Stephens
Hope Springs	Richard Conlon
Five Kinds of Silence	Shelagh Stephenson
Blithe Spirit	Noel Coward
Queen Bee	Margaret Wilson

Centres are reminded that the text should be changed every two years. Moderators praised those centres that reinforced the ethos of the unit by delivering only one unadulterated text and where the practical realisation fully supported the playwright's intentions.

The Performance

Well prepared and rehearsed practical work is always commended by moderators in particular where centres and candidates ensure that any editing of the script does not compromise the playwright's intentions or the continuity for an audience. This year such work was usually reinforced by the selection of an appropriate performance space which had been organised with due regard for the needs of the text and the audience. For example when a classroom has been used candidates ensured that white boards, posters and anything out with the performance has been removed or covered up allowing the audience to be immersed in the demands of the performance. Well prepared work was further reinforced by the careful consideration of a variety of performance elements including costume, properties, sound and lighting. Successful centres created context for an audience using simple but well considered settings.

The most successful candidates had given due and detailed consideration to the realisation of their character/s within the space including vocal modulation, movement, gesture, and use of space including entrances and exits, there was due regard for the realisation of time and place and onstage relationships. Lines and cues were secure and the genre and style were fully understood and executed. Moments of tension and emotion were pointed for an audience. Overall successful candidates ensured their performances were of the required length aiming for 'quality not quantity.'

Centres are reminded that when a candidate is unsure of their lines or they are referencing a script during the filmed performance their marks are restricted to the 'limited' or 'basic' bands.

The Working Records

Generally the presentation of the Working Records this year was good whether hand written or word processed. Moderators continue to appreciate receiving compact Working Records that are simply bound with numbered pages rather than bulky folders or note/art pads.

The most successful Working Records continue to be those that have been divided into three clear sections providing an ongoing record of the development of the journey from 'page to stage'. Most candidates continued to be very good at documenting their understanding of the playwright's intentions and the historical/social background of the play. However, sometimes the length and breadth of the first section of the Working Record was to the detriment of the content of the other two sections.

With regard to the second section the most successfully written were those where textual analysis was implicit and production elements and the areas of study were discussed with due analysis and evaluation of individual and group decisions including the use of semiotics. They further detailed the development and realisation of character/s. However, for some candidates the detailed character background overwhelmed the practicalities of the performance. Other candidates leant too often towards general description, e.g. 'We used the methods of Stanislavski'. The reader wanted to know 'why' such methods were used and 'how' this developed or helped to realise the character on stage. Often candidates wrote that they were 'hot seated', whilst a worthy preparation technique the reader again wanted to know 'how' this furthered the development and realisation of the character. Similarly many candidates wrote that 'in our performance we will use natural lighting,' but failed to explain 'why' and 'how' this would be achieved

Reference was frequently made to 'blocking' the scene but too often this was not fully explained. Whilst some candidates did include annotated scripts these often lacked context and added little to the evaluation and analysis of the realisation of the performance elements. Sketches, drawings and photos were all useful methods of delivering a response to the role of the director, actor and the designer and where they were accompanied by clear and concise descriptions these furthered the reader's understanding of the decisions that candidates had made, making them extremely useful.

In section three most candidates were able, with varying degrees of success, to evaluate whether their intentions for an audience had been fully realised, the higher achieving candidates went on to reflect and evaluate their decisions and the practical realisation of their ideas as director, designer and actor. Similarly they evaluated, with due analysis, the performance of another. However, some candidates tended to reiterate what they had already discussed in section two with little further reflection or evaluation.

All three sections were particularly enhanced when subject specific vocabulary was inherent and moderators commented that relevant knowledge gained from other areas of the course often supported and enhanced the content of the Working Record. Most centres gave due regard to the marking of spelling, punctuation and grammar and ensured that the content was legible.

In Conclusion

The majority of centres have a good understanding of how to prepare candidates for this unit, using appropriate texts and building on the strengths of the areas of study. They are realistic about the achievements of their candidates and apply the marking criteria with rigour whilst ensuring that if required internal moderation has been carried out. They ensure that the moderator can fully understand their marking and that marks have been added up and transferred with care. Such centres ensure that group co-operation is endemic and that candidates are fully conversant on how to take the 'page to the stage' both practically and through detailed written analysis and evaluation.

A582 Drama in the Making

General Comments

Most of the work seen this year was unit appropriate, with candidates demonstrating good scripting and structuring skills. The choice of stimuli was varied and mostly very appropriate. There were a number of new centres this year and that may be the reason why there were more centres who were not quite embracing the rationale of the unit. It is a drama investigation and unlike the other units the emphasis is on devising rather than attempting to create fully realised and polished scenes. Improvisation and structuring are the key areas of study rather than genre, performance style and semiotics. As emphasised in last year's report this is not a matter of lowering expectations, but making devising a key focus and using performance skills to test out the ideas. Many centres are doing far too much work for the unit, particularly for Item 1. The requirement for the unit is to have 3 separate items of work that test the potential of the stimulus to make a good play. The requirement is not to fully realise that play. Plot, character and context are the prime focus, rather than the style of performance. The amount of work being generated by some centres poses the question is it possible to create as much within the time constraints of controlled assessment? It must be the case that centres are using the preparation time to make all the planning decisions rather than starting the actual work on the items within controlled assessment. Preparation time is for general work not preparing work on the items. All work on the items should only start once controlled assessment begins.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Item 1

This should be a scene of no longer than 5 minutes. The scene explores the potential of a specific scenario that is inspired by the stimulus. It may be that structuring devices such as flashback stretch the concept of a scene, however essentially candidates are dwelling in a scenario rather than moving through a series of scenes in the attempt to create a full narrative. The focus is on one defined part of the narrative. The item demonstrates the ability to develop that scene in some detail. The size of the working group should match the potential of the scene and it can be from 2-6 candidates. Experience shows in the time available this is often best done with groups no bigger than 4. There is no requirement for semiotics at this stage of the investigation, it is an improvised drama that aims to produce an engaging situation, strong characters, good dialogue and performed with commitment/full stage discipline.

There were some excellent scenarios created, moderators commented on seeing scenes with strong characters, good dialogue, engaging situations, which were clearly developing the potential of the stimulus. Moderators also commented that in these cases they were all the stronger for being presented in the standard straightforward manner acceptable for improvised work. Such 'uncluttered' performances (the actor in the space) would no doubt warm the cockles of Peter Brook's heart ('The Empty Space' 1971).

Candidates had given themselves a sound start to consider where a play based on the stimulus might go next, the springboard for Item 2.

Candidates who went beyond this creating many scenes in an attempt to complete a more fully realised play for Item 1 are setting themselves too big a task. Also, with such a constrained time scale for the production of the work it potentially may result in a lack of quality in terms of character, dialogue and situation. The focus becomes style and staging rather than substance. Many of these scenes were 10 minutes long and in some cases well over this. Often there was

lighting, sound, costume and props, so the time for the scripting and the acting, the prime focus, must be greatly reduced.

There may be some confusion being caused by the mark scheme especially for new centres. It is a best-fit mark scheme with numerous bullet points to accommodate all the potential types of work that could be created across the 3 items. It does not mean that every bullet point needs to be covered for each item. For instance the bullet point on semiotics is included if a candidate tackles design for an item. The first two bullet points on the mark scheme are the key ones for Item 1, 'use voice and gesture' and 'set up an improvisation'.

Item 2 and 3

Most centres are tackling these items very appropriately and matching the rationale of the unit well. Further performance items invariably develop earlier scenarios and unlike some centre's approach to Item 1 are focused and improvised without moving to full production values. As the scene grows out of the work already done on Item 1 they are often stronger in terms of situation, character and the use of language. The candidates often produce stronger acting. There does seem to be a tendency for some centres to be directing candidates as to what to do for the item i.e. every candidate at the centre does a monologue. This is not really in the spirit of the unit, as candidates should make their own decision after completing Item 1, building on insights made from that work. Such blanket approaches by centres can lead to slightly mechanical work. Moderators noted that it is apparent where candidates are organically developing an investigation and making their own decisions, such ownership is reflected in the quality of the work produced. (It becomes especially apparent in their Working Records).

Monologues are especially popular for Item 2 and there are many very strong responses created. However there is a danger that it becomes a default position, almost a line of least resistance, it's an 'easy option' in terms of organisation. However, plot ideas with character interaction can often be better served with duologues or small group situations. It is a matter of what best develops the stimulus. Many of the monologues seen by moderators tend to have outpourings of character angst, with little real development of the stimulus and nuance in the acting. Centres need to use more discrimination in the marking of such monologues. The stronger monologues often create a narrative arc opening up further potential to move the script on.

Moderators again this year noted many candidates tackled scripting for the Deviser option very well. Generally the strongest work was seen where the candidates developed one scene rather than multiple scenes. One scene is the base requirement. Candidates need to ensure that stage directions are included. Deviser items should not have the text covered with highlighted annotation, the stage directions should contain all relevant explanation. If performing a monologue, such an annotated document is appropriate and forms part of the candidate's Working Record.

Moderators noted that candidates design items showed a general improvement in terms of presenting the items in the expected formats for this type of work. Also, more candidates had the base knowledge to tackle this option. Stage design and lighting are the weakest areas in this respect and costume and make-up the strongest. There are still candidates who are not designing costume, but listing items of clothes that could be worn.

There are a good number of candidates making unrealistic claims for symbolism, giving meaning to assorted features e.g. colour of a t-shirt, jewellery etc., to communicate a variety of messages. It is extremely doubtful that many of these messages would communicate to an audience. Centres need to view such symbolic claims by the candidates more critically and ask candidates to consider how the audience will understand such visual signals.

Moderators once again reported there were centres where candidates offered material for an item that was not appropriate or assessable. There are 3 choices for an item, performance, script or design. It is not appropriate for instance to conduct a workshop or direct other candidates.

Working Records

The starting point for a coherent Working Record is organisation. For several years now reports have asked for 5 defined and ordered sections: Introduction, Item 1; Item 2; Item 3; and Final Evaluation. Candidates who adopt this format are more likely to create a coherent record of their exploration of the stimulus. There was some excellent documenting by candidates of their investigation of the stimulus, with documentation on each item. Once again the best Working Records did not just focus on performance skills but on areas such as scripting ideas, structure and language used. In some centres there is a tendency for candidates to overload on Item 1 and have only cursory material on the other two items. Also some centres are placing far too much emphasis on a full menu of the areas of study and practitioners in Item 1 documentation. Item 1 is an improvised scene not a play. Consequently it is fanciful for candidates to state 'the scene is structured as epic theatre'. The areas of study are best considered when the candidates have completed the three items in their Final Evaluation. Then they can consider what genre, performance style and audience is best suited for a play based on the stimulus. Much of the work included on practitioners is not always very relevant to the improvisation. Candidates need to use knowledge in context and only as relevant to the improvisations being created.

Moderators noted a general improvement in the evaluation of each of the items and the work of a peer or group. However some candidates continue to omit any evaluation on the work of their peer(s). As in previous years the completion of a Final Evaluation that assesses the potential of the stimulus to make a good play, with possible genre, performance style audience seems to confound most centres or be ignored. As mentioned earlier many centres treat Item 1 as a complete play rather than an improvised scene/idea and so do some of this evaluation as part of Item 1.

What not to include in the Working Record:

- Material from and description of workshops undertaken in the preparation period with the teacher.
- Downloads of research material, only include material that is used for the items.
- Work produced as a group, only individual work is included.

What to Include in the Working Record:

- Introduction, with initial range of ideas for the stimulus.
- Ideas for each item, key decisions, what the potential is, and evaluation.
- Final Evaluation what sort of play could be made from this stimulus covering the areas of study (excluding improvisation)?
- Somewhere an evaluation of the work of peer(s), either in one of the item sections or in the Final Evaluation.
- Script and character features of your items, all the focus should not be placed on performance aspects

Moderators noted that work presented for the Working Record by some centres is very extensive and the question was asked by a number of moderators whether this could have been produced under the time constraints of controlled assessment. Centres are reminded that Working Records must be collected in after all sessions and none of the work can be done at home or in un-supervised conditions. The signing of the Centre Authentication Form indicates this has been the case.

General Administration

Moderators appreciated the professionalism of most centres in preparing their submissions so well, reporting a generally high standard of administration from centres. The presentation of evidence by the vast majority of centres on chaptered DVDs with accompanying Performance Running Order sheets (PRO/A582) makes navigation, and the locating of candidates easy for moderators. Some centres used memory sticks instead of a DVD, which is acceptable as long as it has files as for a chaptered DVD. Whatever identification system is used on the DVDs it still helps moderators if candidates do an identity parade before each item giving name and candidate number. It also helps if this is done slowly with a suitable gap between each name. Those centres where candidates held an A4 sheet with their number on were being particularly helpful. The use of the Centre Record of Assessment forms need to indicate clearly the candidates' choice for Items 2 and 3, i.e. Performer, Deviser or Designer. Not all centres initially submitted their MSI form, which is essential. There was an increase this year in the number of clerical errors in relation to adding up candidate marks and/or submitting them to moderation manager. Centres need to check figures carefully before submitting them.

DVD

It is important that a DVD is created, Quick Time files are time consuming for moderators to use and unreliable in presenting candidates' work to best effect. It is preferable if the identity parade of candidates and their performance is all contained in one chapter rather than creating separate ones. This is less time consuming for moderators and it aids identification if you can watch candidates move from parade to performance positions. Blackouts at such points or any point disrupt the work of the moderator. As stated every year in this report the candidate's work can be seen and judged best when no stage lights and blackouts are used. Centres who continue to present the work in this way are not helping moderators to appreciate the work of their candidates. Likewise playing soundtracks over the candidate's performances distracts from the prime purpose of this unit and hinders assessment.

Stimuli

The centres choice of stimulus material to start the drama investigation was in most cases very appropriate and led to good strong scenarios being explored. Stimuli mentioned by moderators were: Fairy Tales; Migrant Crisis; Hogarth's 'Noon'; Munch's 'The Scream'; Barnardos Believe the Children Campaign; 'I Don't Like Mondays'; Social Media; Hillsborough; Child soldiers; Jack the Ripper; Evacuees.

Centres are reminded that a play script is not a suitable stimulus.

Centre Marking

The same points as made last year apply.

Generally centres used good discrimination and there was a good understanding of applying the mark scheme. Exceptions were:

- A tendency to be harsh at the Limited and lower Basic levels. Often candidates who had fulfilled such criteria as, 'uses voice and gesture to create a fully controlled performance' and demonstrated 'some matching of choices made to content and intention' (which is the top of the Basic band descriptor), were being placed in the Limited or low end Basic.
- A tendency to move to the maximum score too readily, more discrimination is needed at the very top end of Accomplished; this is the case for items and Working Records. For instance candidates had not always totally fulfilled such criteria as 'a perceptive and

practically matching of choices of content and intent' even though performance skills were strong.

- Design items being marked generously in some centres. At the higher levels there needs to be clarity regarding ' - a clear understanding of how symbols add meaning and support intent.'
- Working Records awarded Accomplished Band marks when there was no Final Evaluation or little evaluation of the items or only consideration of performance aspects, with little of quality on the script and structure.
- If more than one teacher is delivering the specification it is essential that internal standardisation takes place (it is apparent it does so in the vast majority of cases).

In Conclusion

Centres are thanked for the high level of professionalism in presenting the evidence for this unit and candidates are to be congratulated for producing so much thought provoking and engaging work. Once again this year it was a common thread in moderators' reports that they had enjoyed viewing the candidates' work.

A583 From Concept to Creation

General Comments:

Centres are once again, congratulated on the smooth running of the examination. Most centres visited provided the full spectrum of ability for assessment. Examiners commented very favourably on the high quality of the work presented for examination. Most centres were organised and had prepared well for the examination. The facilities provided mostly allowed for the examination to be conducted under appropriate conditions. There are still some centres where there was extraneous noise interferes with the examination. Centres are reminded that the examination should be conducted under examination conditions. Some examiners reported that in a few centres there seemed to be internal organisational difficulties which meant some candidates went from another examination to their Drama examination with little opportunity to prepare adequately. Centres are reminded that this is a GCSE examination which should be given due care and attention. It was evident that most candidates were enthusiastic about their work and had found the experience enjoyable and rewarding. Centres commented that candidates had embraced and enjoyed the opportunity of working with the script and stimulus items. Centres had engaged in much excellent work in the exploration period which informed the work of candidates.

The trend for linking the work to the theories of practitioners and justifying the choices made in reference to this does seem to be growing. However, as indicated last year, this should not become the main focus of the Working Record.

More candidates this year chose the Design and Deviser options. The choices for the performer briefs tended to be for the devised brief – although many candidates chose to perform a devised piece which included aspects of the text extract. Choices for the devised performer brief were mostly inspired by the stimulus items.

Organisation

Centres continue to appreciate the logistical feat of organising an examination which includes four briefs; groups, solo performances and solo presentations and planned the examination day well, this is most commendable. New centres approaching the specification for the first time have mostly coped very well with the requirements of the examination and were generally very proactive in communicating with examiners. Centres with large numbers of candidates and/or many individual performances/presentations built in natural breaks which examiners appreciated. Some centres continue to use two spaces, one for performance and one for Designer and Deviser presentations. This enables the Designer/Deviser candidates to display their work should they wish to. The discreet space for the Devisers and Designers enables the timetable to run efficiently. There has been an increase this year in candidates performing to an audience of their peers. Most candidates benefit from having a supportive audience of their peers present. More centres this year have introduced evening or Saturday performances with an invited audience of friends and family this is perfectly acceptable as long as all involved appreciate that the occasion is primarily an examination. Examiners frequently commented on the sense of occasion created by centres for the examination.

Fewer centres this year did not fully complete the GITA forms. These are an essential aid to identifying candidates and must be completed before the commencement of the examination. The GITA forms should contain an estimation of the mark range the candidate falls into for both their presentation/performance and Working Records. There are still some centres who are using “Competent”, “Skilful” etc. and specific marks. Some centres did not chapter their DVDs – the specification requires this to be done. Examiners reported few delays in receiving DVDs after the examination.

Comments on Individual Briefs:

Performer Brief (text extract).

The candidates who chose to present the text extract mostly did so with energy and enthusiasm. The most successful developed, highly creative pieces which were influenced by the Epic Theatre style and Pierrots. Most candidates working with the script had clearly understood the play and Brecht's approach to theatre. There were a few less successful candidates, but these merely recited the text rather than perform it. There were some fantastic examples of the use of physical theatre to support the text. Successful candidates approached the text with a clear understanding of context and character and a clear vision for their audience.

Performer Brief (devised)

Those candidates using the text as a stimulus either improvising around its narrative or exploring its themes produced some thought provoking, mature and memorable pieces of theatre. Examiners reported that the creativity of some candidates was breath taking.

Examiners reported seeing some extremely strong pieces which experimented with the use of satire, documentary drama and Brechtian techniques. The work of Joan Littlewood; her beliefs, political views and the influence of Brecht had been utilised in very imaginative ways. Many candidates explored the issues of equality, the role of women in war, PTSD, propaganda and war. Examiners reported seeing some very enjoyable and challenging theatre, based around Peter McGregor and the letters.

The most popular themes explored were war and the role of women.

Fewer candidates this year failed to make connections between the work produced and the stimulus.

More candidates preferred to work alone or in pairs this year. Examiners reported seeing some exceptional monologues and duologues. Again, candidates choosing to work in smaller groupings seemed to focus on the language and setting of their pieces – there was some exceptional work seen here. There were instances, in some centres, where candidates worked in larger groups and failed to ensure that each candidate had the opportunity to demonstrate their ability. Centres are reminded that performances should be a maximum of ten minutes and a minimum of three minutes. Some performances are extending to fifteen minutes and beyond. Few long performances are of the highest quality. The dress rehearsal provides centres with the opportunity to ensure all performances are of the required length.

Once again this year examiners saw some candidates produce pieces which required many scene changes punctuated by black-outs. This tends to diminish the flow of the piece and is to be avoided.

Examiners reported an increasing use of technology which, in the main, was used to enhance the performances. Clever and effective use of projection, lighting and sound was integral to many performances. However there was an over reliance on technology to the detriment of the performances in a few centres.

Deviser Brief

This year saw a rise in the number of scripts being presented for examination. Very few did not follow the accepted conventions of script writing. Candidates had produced some thoughtful and mature pieces of theatre which effectively explored the issues of war, loss and distance in

creative ways. Candidates had considered stage directions, positioning, set, interaction with others and semiotics in their scripts. Most scripts seen would have worked fully as a live staged performance. The best scripts were well crafted with believable characters and clear plotlines.

Examiners reported fewer instances of scripts which contained more than one scene.

Designer Brief

The best work produced by candidates created workable and interesting ideas from a clear design concept. Most candidates gave equal weight to the three design areas and delivered good presentations which clearly linked to the 5 headings. Some candidates had taken inspiration from Joan Littlewood's original interpretation in order to shape their designs in creative and thought provoking ways. Many candidates had considered practicality and justified their decisions.

Plans for set designs continue to show an increase in the use of detailed ground plans. Lighting designers continue to develop the use of cue sheets. An area for further development is the choice of properties both stage and personal. A picture of a prop does not constitute a design.

Presentations

Most candidates were enthusiastic in presenting their work to the examiner. Examiners continue to report that candidates were proud of their work and enjoyed the opportunity to share the processes they had gone through in creating their designs or scripts. A few candidates did not feel able to give a presentation to the examiner which was a shame. The presentation does not have to be formal but can be the student sitting with the examiner talking about their work.

Those candidates who had carefully considered what they wanted to say in their presentation and had made notes tended to be more successful.

Working Records

It was inevitable that given the nature of the text and stimuli that candidates would carry out some research as they prepared their work for examination and this research was clearly used to inform the drama, script or designs created. It should be noted that including reams of research material within the Working Record with no reference as to how it has been used within the creative process is counterproductive. Clear reference to how the research undertaken had impacted on the decisions made is to be encouraged.

Fewer candidates chose to adopt a 'diary' style format for their Working Record. The most successful and informative Working Records focused clearly on the processes involved in creating the work for examination and covered all the areas of study effectively.

Examiners are still reporting that candidates are submitting Working Records which far exceed the guidance given, as to length, in the examination paper. Some candidates seem to have spent many hours on these documents which are worth 25% of the marks for this unit.

Centres are reminded that candidates have one hour after the dress rehearsal to evaluate their work. The standard of evaluation continues to improve. Candidates are making pertinent and perceptive comments. Examiners reported a year on year improvement in the number of candidates submitting incisive analytical evaluations.

There were no reported references to centres using writing frames this year which is most pleasing.

In Conclusion

The choice of text was welcomed by most centres who felt that it had presented an interesting challenge for their candidates. Feedback from candidates has been very positive. The quality of work produced by candidates reflects the excellent teaching in centres. It is a privilege and pleasure for examiners to witness the mature and interesting work of so many candidates.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

[/www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2016

