



Pearson

Moderator's Report Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2018

Pearson Edexcel GCSE
Drama and Theatre (1DR0/01)
Component 1 Devising

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2018

Publications Code 1DR0_01_1806_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

Component 1: Devising 1DR0/01

40% of the qualification – 60 marks

Introduction

This is the first year of examination of the three component GCSE specification 1DR0 and as such, the Coursework Component 1DR0/01 is new to centres; however it is well-supported by a myriad of online resources and inset events that are available to access. This report is designed to offer support to centres by highlighting positives from the 2018 series as well as outlining key areas for improvement when looking ahead to the 2019 series. The Principal Moderator's report is to be used in conjunction with the support materials available on the Pearson website, to best support centres for the 2019 series:

Link to Pearson website:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/qualifications/edexcel-gcses/drama-2016.coursematerials.html#filterQuery=category:Pearson-UK:Category%2FSpecification-and-sample-assessments>

Content of 1DR0/01

The 1DR0/01 Component is made up of Portfolio Evidence and a final Devised Performance/ Design, covering three assessment objectives; AO1, AO4 (Portfolio Evidence) and AO2 (The final Devised Performance). The focus of the component is the creation and development of a devised performance inspired by up to three, centre-chosen stimuli often linked to a theme, topic or issue.

Key elements of content:

- For Paper 1DR0.01 candidates are provided with up to three stimuli, by the teacher assessor, to explore and use for the basis of their own devised performance.
- The minimum group size is 3 performing candidates and the maximum group size is 6 performing candidates. In addition, each group may have one designer from each of the skills areas; lighting, sound, costume and set design. This means that the minimum group size will always be 3 candidates and the maximum group size can be up to 10 candidates if each design option is utilised.
- Candidates are assessed on AO2; therefore, the teacher assessor must provide evidence of the candidates' final Devised Performance on either DVD, USB or an external hard drive.
- The candidates must also produce Portfolio Evidence, which is used to assess candidates' work against AO1 and AO4. The Portfolio Evidence details the initial response to the stimuli, exploration of ideas, refinements and rehearsals and finally evaluation and analysis of the process and the final Devised Performance.

- The word count for the Portfolio Evidence is a maximum of 2,000 words; however, candidates also have the option to provide a verbal portfolio of up to 10 minutes of audio or camera recorded evidence. In addition, candidates can choose to provide the evidence using a mix of written and verbal formats with a recommended word count of 700 – 1,000 words and a time limit of 4-5 minutes.

There is essential guidance for all centres about all GCSE Components in the Administrative Support Guide (ASG) document, which is updated for each series. Centres must download this from the Pearson website as soon as it is available in the Autumn Term. The Assessment forms for all three components are available as both PDF and editable Word documents on the Pearson website and these are also regularly updated and improved, as such amended authentication forms for the 2019 series are already available to download.

All centres, including those entirely new to Pearson GCSE Drama for entry in 2019, are advised to re-visit the Specification document (updated for GCSE 2018) for further details of the requirements of the component. There are also other useful support documents available to download via the GCSE Drama home page including the GCSE Drama 9-1 Guidance for Component 1 Portfolio, the GCSE Drama Frequently Asked Questions and the Component 1 Exemplars.

The main link to the Drama home page is:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/qualifications/edexcel-gcses/drama-2016.html>

And the link to the teaching and learning materials:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/qualifications/edexcel-gcses/drama-2016.coursematerials.html#filterQuery=Pearson-UK:Category%2FTeaching-and-learning-materials>

Chosen Stimuli and Themes

Popular themes for 1DR01.01 Devising included, but were not limited to:

- War/ Conflict
- Madness
- Mental health issues
- Post-traumatic stress disorder
- Eating disorders
- Gender inequality
- Outsiders
- Persecution/Standing up for your rights
- The impact of technology / Social media

The centre choices of stimuli and themes were very closely linked to the popular choices in 2017 on the legacy specification for 5DR01. The themes meant that several centres selected a narrative approach to the devising work whilst others created work that was more surreal and episodic. Stimuli tended to be largely literary with a significant proportion of centres using music, video and/ or printed/

digital images. Poems were also a popular choice with candidates using lines and words from poems in their final performances. Unexpectedly, some centres issued a single word as a stimulus, such as 'Persecution', 'Inequality' and 'Terror', this supported some candidates in focusing on a theme and intention for the audience. Centres also used single word stimuli to supplement written stimuli.

Pearson does not recommend or approve any material issued as a stimulus and there is no preferred stimuli format, content or theme. The choice of stimuli is the centre's responsibility and as such it is important that centres issue materials that engage the interests of their candidates.

- Centres can issue up to three different stimuli materials; however, they must not exceed this maximum.
- Centres may wish to issue only one of two stimuli materials, this is permissible, but centre should consider if they have offered the candidates enough material to support their creative intentions.
- Centres may issue different stimuli materials to different groups or classes within their centre, or they may wish to issue all candidates the same stimuli materials; again this is the centre's responsibility and there is no preferred option.
- A small number of centres had used a play-text as the stimulus for the Devised Performance which is not in line with the specification requirements. Play-texts are explored in Component 2 and Component 3, and as such are not permitted in Component 1. Further details are available in the Frequently Asked Questions document and the specification.

The role of the teacher in facilitating the devising process was key in terms of candidate achievement, as was the choice of stimuli/ theme/ topic. Less effective choices included stimuli, topics and themes that candidates could not relate to, or felt uncomfortable with, such as violent acts and physical assaults. Or where the candidates had moved away from their initial intention, meaning that the work produced lacked structure and direct. Positive choices showed the teacher as facilitator, enabling candidates the strategies to explore the stimuli effectively, allowing them to be clear on their intention for the audience.

The Portfolio Evidence

The practical exploration of the stimuli, the devising, rehearsing and refining processes and analysis and evaluation of the process and final performance are captured in the candidates' Portfolio Evidence. The Portfolio Evidence can be in the following formats, with no preferred format:

- handwritten/typed evidence between 1500 and 2000 words or
- recorded/verbal evidence between 8 and 10 minutes or
- a combination of handwritten/typed evidence (between 750 and 1000 words) and recorded/verbal evidence (between 4 and 5 minutes)

The majority of Portfolio Evidence sent for moderation was typed evidence, with some examples of verbal portfolios and very few examples of a combination of both formats.

The Portfolio Evidence was most successful when the six questions, as set out in the specification, were addressed across the work. Candidates must be given the opportunity to record the exploration, refinement and rehearsal processes over the course of the component. These notes may then be used to support the completion of the final Portfolio Evidence. It was clear that a number of centres had completed the Portfolio Evidence in stages across the process, with the candidates completing question 1 and 2 immediately after they had responded to the stimuli materials and completed their initial exploration of the stimuli deciding on an intention for the audience. This was a supportive approach, allowing candidates to record their ideas as they occurred making for more analytical and reflective responses overall.

In many centres, candidates recorded accurate word counts or timings for their Portfolio Evidence at the end of the work; however, many centres failed to provide this information. The Candidate Authentication Form for Component 1 has been updated on the Pearson website to include word counts and timings. It is important that the maximum timing or word counts for the Portfolio Evidence are adhered to, as any work beyond the maximum must not be assessed by the teacher assessor and will not be moderated. In cases where the word limit was exceeded, some of the best work came after the 2,000 words, although this was not always the case. Furthermore, some candidates produced work that was significantly under the wordcount or timings, this did not allow the candidates the opportunity to write analytically and in depth and was therefore, self-penalising.

The majority of Portfolio Evidence was presented on A4 paper, word processed and structured using the six questions. Some centres provided additional questions and writing frames which was supportive to many less able candidates although this could be somewhat limiting for some of the more able students. Some candidates chose to write in continuous prose and this was effective when the six questions were addressed and embedded in their work.

Design candidates generally included the additional documentation that is a requirement of all design skills; however, some candidates had included the documentation into the Portfolio Evidence, thereby limiting the coverage of the six questions. Design candidates must answer or address the same six questions as performance candidates and all additional documentation that must be provided should be included as appendices to the Portfolio Evidence. In addition, all design candidates must ensure that they stay focused on their design skill and are not tempted to discuss the acting, the same is true of some performance candidates who spend large portions of their 'significant moments' question addressing the inclusion of design aspects rather than focusing on moments that supported and developed their role as performer.

Some centres had encouraged candidates to reflect upon practitioner theory which is not a specific focus for GCSE; however, on the whole, this enabled candidates to meet the demands of question 4 when addressing choices of structure, genre, form, language and character. In addition, candidates were particularly successful when the teacher assessor had clearly taught the candidates discretely about genre, style, structure, language and characterisation to communicate intention to the audience. Those candidates that has been taught how to devise effectively, research, refine and rehearse their work achieved better outcomes, as did those who had an assured grasp and use of drama terminology.

In many centres, candidates included health and safety requirements in their Portfolio Evidence; however, this year a significant number of candidates and centres failed to cover this area which is one of the essential areas of coverage as outlined in the specification. Centres are therefore, reminded that candidates must be taught discreetly about health and safety issues and the inclusion of these considerations during their devising rehearsals, as well as in their Portfolio Evidence. More guidance can be found in Guidance for Writing the Portfolio on the Pearson website. In addition, when discussing how the stimuli was initially explored, many candidates explained their research. Whilst research is pivotal and produced some very thought provoking devised work, the demands of this question mean that candidates should focus on how drama strategies were used to explore the stimuli.

Teacher assessors tended to be lenient when awarding the mark for AO1 due to the larger range of marks available for this assessment objective. There was also evidence of centres awarding marks for what they had witnessed in the classroom in terms of the process, refinements and rehearsals, rather than assessing the Portfolio Evidence discreetly for AO1 and AO4. Candidates can only receive marks for AO1 based upon the evidence they provide in their Portfolio Evidence.

Some teacher assessors only awarded AO4 marks for question 5 and 6 of the Portfolio Evidence rather than awarding evidence of AO4 analysis and evaluation across the whole Portfolio Evidence. Candidates should be taught to analyse and evaluate for each of the six questions of coverage. In addition, where there was evidence of verbal portfolios the teacher assessor tended to be lenient in their application of AO1 and in particular AO4 as many of the verbal portfolios provided for moderation contained very little evaluation, with some isolated analysis.

General summative advice for centres, based on the 2018 series:

Candidates should:

- Ensure that they cover the six questions and essential areas of coverage as outlined in the specification
- Ensure they make full use of the word count/ timings to allow for the detail of analysis required and the comprehensive explanations needed to access marks at the higher level
- Ensure they include health and safety considerations into their working practices and their Portfolio Evidence
- Avoid general discussion and ensure that they analyse and evaluate across the whole of the Portfolio Evidence
- Ensure they use drama terminology to clearly explain and analyse the 'drama' that took place when devising, rehearsing and refining
- Ensure that they stay focused on their performance/ design skill throughout the Portfolio Evidence.
- Ensure that in question 5 they stay focused on their skill in the final performance

Teacher-assessors should:

- Offer opportunities for candidates to record clear examples for their notes, to support the completion of the Portfolio Evidence

- Offer appropriate support materials such as writing frames, ensuring that these support without restricting, and that they cover the six questions and essential areas of coverage as outlined in the specification
- Facilitate the devised work by offering appropriate and engaging stimuli materials
- Support candidates by setting appropriate deadlines
- Check notes carefully to guard against plagiarism and to ensure that sources have been acknowledged
- Support students in understanding and addressing health and safety issues
- Ensure all candidate who select a design skill complete the additional documentation

The Final performance/ Design

The requirement of the component is for each candidate to perform in, or design for, a final devised performance. This must be recorded from a **fixed camera** position onto a clearly labelled disc, USB or external hard drive enclosed in a hard, protective case/ envelope, ensuring that the hardware is new and free of viruses. The file types must be compatible for both Windows and/or Mac devices, therefore file types that can be played on VLC Media Player, Windows Media Player or QuickTime Movie must be used.

The quality of the recording is of paramount importance; centres must ensure that they are able to produce a clear, good quality recording for the moderator. Further details about the importance of the recording are available in the ASG document.

The majority of centres provided their recorded evidence on DVD or USB with very few centres submitting their work on external hard drives. In the vast majority of cases, recordings were clearly chapterised and clearly labelled, both on the disc and on the case. Equally the majority of recordings were of good to reasonable quality, with some examples of excellent practice. The best practice was often seen where teacher assessors had seemingly viewed the recording although this is not a requirement of the specification.

Candidates must identify themselves on the recording with clear statement of name and candidate number. Teachers must also clearly identify candidates on the Candidate /Coursework Authentication Forms. In 2018, whilst many centres had ensured that candidates were easily identifiable, moderators reported that identification was still a problem with some work. It is paramount that identifications take place directly before the recording of the performance and ideally with no breaks in the recording so that the candidates' appearance is exactly the same as their appearance in the performance and the identifications cannot be mixed up with other recordings or groups. It is also important that candidates wear costumes/ clothing that makes them easily identifiable for moderation purposes. There was a large proportion of centres where candidates had chosen to wear 'blacks', whilst this is understandable in many ensemble style performances, it does not support the moderation process. In addition, centres must ensure that all design candidates also identify themselves as part of their group's introductions.

There were very few instances of recordings that would not play due to the new requirements; however, there were several cases where centres had to contact Pearson for 'lost coursework' due to the evidence of the final Devised Performances

being lost or the files being corrupted. Centres must ensure that they backup all files on their centre's system.

There were also a few centres who had stated that candidates were absent on the day of the performance so had not provided AO2 evidence for these candidates, even though this is a coursework component and the work should have been filmed at a different time. Centres must ensure that all candidates' work is captured on film, even if this is not on the day assigned by the centre to complete the work. If a candidate does not perform in the final work then they must not receive a mark for AO2, and the lack of participation in the Final Performance will also impact their ability to answer question 5, 'their contribution to the final performance' in their Portfolio Evidence.

This year there was work produced from a range of design candidates; with lighting, costume and sound being the most popular choices. There were some issues with the moderator not being able to see clearly some moments of the performance due to the lighting design; therefore, centres need to support candidates in considering their lighting design and the quality of the recording for moderation. 'Realism' as a chosen style was more challenging for candidates in a design role; in particular, lighting and sound. The design candidates tended to be more imaginative and creative when the work was episodic and contained elements of surrealism; however, this was not always the case.

On the whole the performances were creative and had clear intentions for the audience. A range of styles and genres were adopted, with a didactic and episodic approach being the most popular. It was reassuring to see so many candidates opting to take on a design role with many candidates really embracing this opportunity and creating work that was creative and incredibly supportive of the performers and their group's intention for the audience.

Best practice for the recording included:

- Clear, well-paced, introductions with candidates stating both name and candidate number in full length shot – at the beginning of the performance with no break before the performance
- Use of A4 sheets with name and number held up for the camera
- Candidates dressed in the same way for the introduction as in the performance itself, with candidates explaining any costume changes
- Clear written descriptions of candidates by the teacher-assessor on the Coursework Authentication Forms, with the centre identifying where in the candidate line up each candidate appears, and in addition giving timings of where the candidates demonstrate the skills in the assessment criteria
- The wearing of different, distinct costumes or clothes, with ensemble groups choosing different colour t-shirts rather than 'all blacks'
- The provision of photographs of the sampled candidates in performance groups
- Work that was labelled with the group number and name of the performance chapterised.

General summative advice for centres, based on the 2018 series:

Candidates should:

- Ensure the work is carefully rehearsed and polished for performance with a focus on creativity and impact on the audience
- Engage fully with their role, thinking about how their role impacts the work as a whole
- Work collaboratively and contribute to the exploration, refinement and rehearsal process
- Shape and develop ideas practically rather than repeating and polishing without progression
- Share their work in progress with the class to receive feedback for improvement
- Use their research skills to inform their performance and development of ideas
- Make clear notes, including examples, throughout the process and reflect on their final performance straight after the performance takes place.

Teacher-assessors should:

- Devote 40% of teaching time to the devising process and the skills that candidates need to be taught in order to devise effectively
- Select stimuli appropriate to the needs, abilities and interests of each individual group of candidates or cohort
- Use verbal evaluation and discussion to support the candidates development of their work, facilitating this process without directing or having creative input
- Set deadlines to allow candidates to work to the final performance date
- Ensure candidates have the opportunity to conduct technical and dress rehearsals
- Provide a supportive audience to allow candidates to be comfortable when performing
- Record the performances and ensure that they are saved in the formats as set out in the ASG, as well as ensuring that the files are backed up on the centre's network.
- Ensure the recordings are made from a fixed position
- Provide clear introductions by candidate name and number
- Ensure that clear descriptions are provided on the Coursework Authentication forms.

Teacher – assessors must ensure that candidates adhere to the group sizes and timings for the Devised Performances:

A group must contain between three and six performance students. In addition, there can be up to one designer per role, per group – making a possible maximum group size of 10 candidates (6 performers and 4 designers).

The regulatory requirements are that groups must complete a minimum performance time of 4 minutes for this component. Candidates (performance and design) who do not meet the regulatory minimum performance requirement of 4 minutes will be awarded 0 marks for AO2. There were no examples this year of

candidates producing work below the regulatory timings and centres should be congratulated on how they have supported their lower achieving candidates.

The recommended minimum performance times have been provided to ensure that each candidate within the group has sufficient time to access all levels of the assessment criteria:

- 3–4 performance candidates (group) 10 to 15 minutes
- 5–6 performance candidates (group) 20 to 25 minutes

Centres should be aware that performance times that are between the regulatory minimum (4 minutes) and the recommended minimum (10 minutes) may not allow candidates to evidence their skills fully in order to access all levels of the assessment criteria. In addition, teacher assessors are required to stop marking after the maximum performance time has passed.

Selection of sample for moderation

There was some confusion in this first year with regards to the sampling of candidates' work. Centres that followed the guidance in the ASG sent the correct work; however, a number of centres followed the pre-selection on Edexcel online, as this was the procedure and system in place from the legacy specification. Paul Webster, the subject advisor for Performing Arts, did contact all examination officers to instruct them to follow the ASG, but in some cases this message did not get passed on to the teacher assessor in the centre, or the examinations officer made the decision to send the pre-selected sample. In the 2019 series, the pre-selected sample will be removed from the EDI to avoid further confusion.

The teacher- assessor must select the sample after the internal assessment has taken place to reflect the overall mark range of the cohort. Pearson will not select the sample and any pre- selection made on the EDI printouts must be ignored. The reason for this decision is because Pearson and the moderators do not know how centres have grouped the candidates, how many candidates are in each group, or which groups the highest and lowest achieving candidates are in.

The sample that centres select must include the performance/design realisation and Portfolio Evidence of all sampled candidates. This should be selected from a maximum of four different performance groups (although this could be from as few as one group if there are 6 performance candidates and 4 designers in that group, containing the highest and achieving candidates).

The sample selected by the centre must include:

- The highest overall scoring candidate
- The lowest overall scoring candidate
- The work of at least 8 further candidates with a range of marks between the highest and the lowest scoring candidates.

The sample size tends to be the work of 10 candidates; however, there are occasions when the sample is smaller or larger than 10 candidates' work.

- If there are fewer than 10 candidates in the centre taking GCSE Drama, centres must send the work of all candidates.

- If there are 10 candidates in the centre taking GCSE Drama, centres must send the work of all 10 candidates
- If there are 11 to 99 candidates in the centre taking GCSE Drama, centres must select the work of 10 candidates, from no more than 4 performance groups to include the highest and lowest achieving candidates based on their total mark out of 60.
- If there are 100 to 199 candidates in the centre taking GCSE Drama, centres must send the work of 15 candidates, including the highest and lowest achieving candidates. The work should be from as fewer groups as possible, with a maximum of 5 groups sent if candidates are all working in groups of 3.
- If there are 200+ candidates in the centre taking GCSE Drama, centres must send the work of 20 candidates, again to include the work of the highest and lowest achieving candidates. The work should be from as fewer groups as possible with a maximum of 7 groups sent if candidates are all working in groups of 3.

Moderators may contact a centre and request the work of additional candidates. This can be for a variety of reasons and centres must ensure that all work that is not sent in the original sample is in the centre, available for submission, with the Coursework Authentication Forms completed and signed by the candidates and the teacher assessor. There are further details regarding these procedures in the JCQ instructions for conducting coursework:

<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/coursework/instructions-for-conducting-coursework-2018-2019>

Administration

Most of the administration for Component 1 was completed accurately by centres. Centres do need to check the total mark accurately on the Coursework Forms and then transferred the total mark to the EDI correctly. There were a number of cases where moderators had to contact centres to check the centre marks, as the mark on the Coursework Authentication Form did not match the marks on the EDI printout or on Edexcel online.

Centres that placed their work in attainment order, from the highest achieving candidate to the lowest achieving candidate, clearly supported the moderation process. In addition, some centres placed the candidates' work in group order which supported the identification of candidates. Centres are reminded that the Coursework Authentication Form must be stapled onto the candidate' Portfolio Evidence and that the inclusion of plastic wallets is not permitted. The ASG details how the Portfolio Evidence should be presented and sent for moderation.

The majority of centres did include the EDI printout or a printout of the marks online; however, it is paramount that this document is the official EDI printout that contains the centre declaration statement. This statement must be signed by the teacher assessor before the document is sent to the moderator. In addition, centres must ensure that all Coursework Authentication Forms are signed by both the teacher and the candidate, otherwise the moderator will request an additional signed copy.

For the first year of this new specification, teacher-assessors had worked incredibly hard on the administration and there were relatively few issues. Centres are reminded that there is a coursework check Sheet available on Pearson online that should be included in the pack sent to the moderator. This allows centres to ensure that they have met all of the requirements and included all of the materials required.

A number of teacher-assessors provided detailed comments on the Coursework Authentication Form and/or on the candidates' Portfolio Evidence. Some teacher-assessors sign-posted where candidates had covered each of the assessment objectives on the Portfolio Evidence - AO1, AO4; this is not a requirement of the specification; however, it was very useful for moderation.

Many centres sent their stimuli materials to the moderator, either in the pack or by copying and pasting the images, poems etc. into the box provided on the Coursework Authentication Form, both of these methods supported the moderation process, in particular when different groups in the centre had used different stimuli material.

The Coursework Authentication Form has been updated on the website for 2019 to include group titles as well as numbers, and in addition to enable candidates to record word counts and timings. This is intended to support centres and moderators in 2019, as in 2018 there were a number of examples where wordcounts and timings were not adhered to; centres must check the ASG and the specification for guidance.

Pearson Feedback and Support to Centres

Enquiries about Results

These are completed by members of the senior team using the original Portfolio Evidence, and the Final Performance Recordings as well as the Assessment Forms which have been returned to centres. An Enquiry can be requested for the whole centre as the original moderation process will be repeated by the EAR moderator and centres will be charged for re-moderation unless centre marks are re-instated. A detailed report will be produced for each centre, providing feedback for the centre, and explaining the findings of the re-moderation process.

Drama Subject Advisory Team

Paul Webster, a full-time member of Pearson staff, has been available again throughout the 2018 series to respond to centre queries and to support centres via telephone and email contact as well as through social networking sites. This has proved successful, in particular with the introduction of the new specification and the 9-1 assessment processes.

He and his team are available to respond to centre queries on TeachingPerformingArts@Pearson.com

Candidate queries can be addressed to students@pearson.com.

It must be noted that the Subject Advisor has no access to centre data and cannot comment on the moderation process in terms of mark regression or on the content of E9 reports to centres. Where centres require more detailed information, an EAR must be requested for that paper.

Approval of material to be used or any administrative issues is beyond the remit of the subject advisory team.

Training From Pearson

Pearson has a programme of national, face to face, free standardisation meetings, as well as online training. All details are available on the Pearson website via the training home page.

Conclusion

In the first year of the 9-1 GCSE specification, it is pleasing to note how hard centres have worked to understand the requirements of the specification. It is clear that many centres have accessed and used the support materials available on the Pearson website as well as attending inset training and purchasing some of the support materials and guides produced.

Centre marking in the vast majority of centres is accurate in terms of the rank order of marks for candidates sampled; however, many teacher-assessors have struggled to accurately judge the level at which their candidates are working. This was evident across all of the Assessment Objectives, but in particular AO1 where there is a larger spread of marks available. There was evidence of severe marking by centres at the lower end of the ability range, sometimes for example, where candidates have been able to explain their response to the stimuli, their intentions for the audience and some of their ideas and refinements in rehearsals.

Equally, at the top of the ability range, teacher-assessors did not always accurately assess their candidates' work, over-rewarding achievement when compared to the National Standard. It appeared that teacher-assessors tended to assume that their highest achieving candidate was very often worthy of marks in the top level or full marks. Given the increased rigour of both assessment and content in the new 9-1 GCSE Drama, it is likely that for the first few years of the specification, only the very highest achieving candidates nationwide will consistently meet the demands of level 5 for Component 1, particularly with regards to AO1 Create and Develop. The evidencing of candidates' practical ability to create and develop devised work through their theory portfolios is an entirely new skill at GCSE and as the specification develops it is predicted that teachers and candidates will become more skilled at addressing this.

Teacher-assessors must consider carefully when making judgements about the quality of their candidates' work. Free standardisation courses and materials provided by Pearson will continue to be available to support all centres in making these judgements, enabling the committed work of all teachers to be applied most effectively to all aspects of assessment and learning within 1DR0.01.

Candidates of Pearson GCSE Drama represent a wide and varied range of abilities, cultures and backgrounds. Their devised work for Component 1 has reflected their personal interests and experiences. Candidates' work on this component allows them further to develop the skills needed for creating devised work for performance, as well as furthering their grasp of each individually selected theme, topic or issue. The shift of focus to not only exploration, but to process, rehearsal and the completion of a final performance appears to have been welcomed and embraced by candidates, teacher-assessors and moderators alike.

Moderators in 2018 commented that, in the vast majority of case, GCSE Drama candidates were exceptionally focused and committed to their work in Drama; for the entire team, there was a sense that it had been a highly positive experience and that candidates of all abilities had risen to the challenge of devising a performance, with very few candidates failing to complete something worthy of a mark against each of the assessment criteria.

Based on the 2018 series, centres should:

- Read/ review both the Specification document for GCSE Drama 9-1, the Administrative Support Guide (ASG) and the GCSE Drama 9-1 Guidance for Writing the Portfolio (2018) in preparation for delivering 1DR0.01
- Make the most positive choice of stimuli material for each individual group of candidates/ classes/cohort
- Ensure that the very best possible recordings are made and selected for moderation
- Use this report as a reminder of best practice when making the recordings
- Use the standardisation materials to refresh and refine teacher-assessors' grasp of the National Standard
- Refer closely to the Administrative Support Guide, the Specification and this report when supporting candidates with their timings for the Devised Performance and their timings and wordcounts for the Portfolio Evidence.
- Refer closely to the Administrative Support Guide when preparing materials for submission to the moderator and when selecting centre samples

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom