



Pearson
Edexcel

Examiners' Report

Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2022

Pearson Edexcel

GCSE Drama (1DR0)

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 2022

Publications Code 1DR0_01_2206_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

Component 1: Devising 1DR0/01

40% of the qualification - 60 marks

Introduction

This is the third year of examination of the three component GCSE specification 1DR0, with the two-year break from examinations due to the pandemic; as such, the Coursework Component 1DR0/01 is still relatively new to centres; however, it is well-supported by a myriad of online resources and inset events that are available to access for free on the Pearson website. This report is designed to offer support to centres by highlighting positives from the 2022 series as well as outlining key areas for improvement when looking ahead to the 2023 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 2023 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, covering three assessment objectives: AO1, AO4 (Portfolio Evidence) and AO2 (The final Devised Performance/ Design Realisation). The focus of the Component is the creation and development of a devised performance inspired by up to three, Centre-chosen stimuli which can be linked to a theme, topic or issue.

Key elements of content:

- For Paper 1DR0.01 candidates are provided with up to three stimuli, chosen by the teacher assessor, to explore and use for the basis of their own devised performance. The stimuli **MUST** be selected and provided by the Centre, not the students, to support the candidates in devising their work.
- 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 skill 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. It is not permitted to have two design candidates following the same skill and assigned to the same group, or for one designer to be assessed for their design skills across more than one group or performance. For 2022, an adaptation was made to allow candidates to devise a duologue or a monologue to support social distancing measures and disruption to time spent in drama studios due to the pandemic.
- Candidates are assessed on AO2; therefore, the teacher assessor must provide evidence of the candidates' final Devised Performance and upload this to the LWT (Learner Work Transfer) with the candidates' Portfolio Evidence and all other supporting documentation; including the additional documentation for any design candidates.
- The candidates must 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 final evaluation and analysis of the process and the candidates' skill demonstrated in the final Devised Performance/ Design realisation.

- The word count for the Portfolio Evidence is a maximum of 2,000 words and must be adhered to; 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 word count of 700 - 1,000 words and a maximum time limit of 4-5 minutes. The purpose of the maximum word counts, and time limits is to ensure that there is parity for all centres and candidates nationally. Therefore, any work produced beyond the maximum word counts and time limits must not be marked by the Centre and will not be considered for moderation.

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 annually. The Assessment forms for all three components are available as editable Word documents and Excel Spreadsheets on the Pearson website and these are also regularly updated and improved, as such Centres should download the new forms annually.

All centres, including those entirely new to Pearson GCSE Drama for entry in 2023, are advised to re-visit the Specification document 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, as well as past training materials with moderator commentaries to support centres in applying the National Standard.

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
- Inequality across a range of areas: gender, sexuality, race and religion
- Outsiders
- Persecution/Standing up for your rights
- The impact of technology / social media
- The impact of Covid, diseases and the pandemic

The stimuli 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. 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 but was also limiting for many candidates as they were not given the opportunity to find their own meaning from the stimuli and research ideas for performance. Centres also used single word stimuli to supplement written stimuli, such as news reports. In 2022, there was an increase in centres selecting a theme for exploration and/ or a topical event that directly impacted the local community and therefore, the candidates. Centres should ensure that if issuing a theme that this

is through a range of stimuli materials and is an area of interest to the candidates to ensure that they engage with the devising process and are not limited.

Pearson does not recommend any stimulus materials 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 or two stimuli materials, this is permissible, but centres 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 approach.
- Centres must consider the suitability of any stimuli issued to candidates or of chosen themes. All materials **must be age appropriate**. Moderators in 2019 and 2022 reported an increase in devised performances that explored topics such as sexual violence, rape and suicide often in graphic detail.
- 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 and centres are advised that if a play text is issued as a stimulus for Component 1, it may have an impact on the moderation process. Further details are available in the Frequently Asked Questions document and the Specification.

The role of the teacher in facilitating the devising process is key in terms of candidate achievement, as is the choice of stimuli/ theme/ topic. Less effective choices in 2022 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 direction. 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 and to make the needed refinements to communicate effectively with their audience. Despite the pandemic, teacher-assessors had clearly worked hard to ensure that candidates had been taught how to devise and had been given opportunities to collaborate where possible.

The Portfolio Evidence

The practical exploration of the stimuli, the devising, rehearsing and refining processes and the analysis and evaluation of the planned intention and the final performance are captured in the candidates' Portfolio Evidence. The Portfolio Evidence can be presented in the following ways, 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 in 2022 was typed evidence, with some examples of verbal portfolios and a 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, or used as headings to structure the Portfolio Evidence. Candidates must be given the opportunity to record the exploration, refinements, 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 several 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 on their work or on the CCIS form; however, many centres failed to provide this information. It is important that the maximum timing or word counts for the Portfolio Evidence are recorded on the documentation and 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, and often all of the responses for question 5 and question 6 could not be considered which had a significant impact on the assessment of AO4 analysis and evaluation. 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. Centres are reminded that this is a coursework component and feedback can be given on the first draft of the work; therefore, candidates can be given the opportunity to edit their work ensuring that they do not exceed the word count. It is not permissible for the teacher-assessor to select sections of the candidates' work, across the whole evidence, to omit from the total wordcount, the section that should not be marked is the final section of the work.

Most of the Portfolio Evidence was word processed and structured using the six questions. Some centres provided additional questions and writing frames which were not always supportive and are not in line with the JCQ guidance on the use of writing frames for NEAs. Some candidates chose to write in continuous prose, and this was effective when the six questions were addressed and embedded in their work; however, some candidate responses lost focus or did not fully address the demands of all of the six questions as outlined in the Specification. Some of the best work used the six questions as a structure for the Portfolio Evidence and saw students writing detailed responses to question 3 and 4, which supported the AO1 mark.

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 spent large portions of their 'significant moments' or questions 5 and 6 addressing the inclusion of design aspects rather than focusing on moments that supported and developed their role as performers. Additional information and support in answering the portfolio questions is available on the Pearson website, this includes how the design candidates can respond to the questions.

Some centres had encouraged candidates to reflect upon practitioner theory which is not a specific focus for GCSE; however, in the most part, 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 discretely about health and safety issues and the inclusion of these considerations during their devising rehearsals, as well as in their Portfolio Evidence. Health and safety considerations can be addressed across any of the six questions, or in a separate section if that is more appropriate for the candidates. 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 to the process, 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 and how candidates used drama to explore their initial ideas and intentions from the Centre provided stimuli, rather than continuing to discuss their ideas generically.

Teacher assessors were much more accurate in their application of the assessment criteria in 2022. This was the case across all of the Assessment Objectives, but particularly for AO2 and AO4. Some Centres that tended to be lenient were so when applying the mark for AO1, possibly 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. In addition, some candidates produced Portfolio Evidence that was secure, but this was not fully credited by the teacher- assessor, possibly due to their lack of collaboration in the classroom.

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. It is crucial that candidates adhere to the maximum word count of 2,000 words. In 2022, there was evidence of an increased number of candidates producing work beyond the maximum word count which had a direct impact on the candidates' achievement against the AO4 criteria as this work could not be assessed or moderated.

General summative advice for centres, based on the 2022 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; however, ensure that they do not produce work beyond the maximum word count as this will not be considered in the final assessment.
- 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 and in the final performance/ design realisation
- Ensure that they stay focused on their performance/ design skill throughout the Portfolio Evidence
- Ensure that for question 2, they discuss the exploration of the stimuli material that took place in the drama studio, using explorative strategies such as still images, hot-seating, thought tracking, forum theatre etc.
- Ensure that for question 4 all the areas are discussed; characterisation, genre, style, form, structure and language - by analyse and evaluating key moments of the process and performance, rather than responding in a list that is generic and lacks depth
- Ensure that in question 5 and 6 they stay focused on their skill in the final performance, rather than focusing on the process. Candidates should analyse and evaluate how their skill contributed to the final performance; the use of the first person is supportive in responding to this question.

Teacher-assessors should:

- Offer opportunities for candidates to record clear examples for their notes (during the devising process), to support the completion of the Portfolio Evidence
- Offer appropriate support to enable candidates to cover the six questions and essential areas of coverage as outlined in the specification, with written feedback on one draft of the Portfolio Evidence focused on the assessment criteria
- Facilitate the devised work by offering engaging stimuli materials that are age appropriate and intervene if the candidates' chosen intention or theme is not appropriate for GCSE aged candidates.
- Support candidates by setting appropriate deadlines
- Check notes carefully to guard against plagiarism and to ensure that sources have been acknowledged. Candidates should be encouraged to write in the first person using 'I' to help guard against work from the same group being too similar
- Support students in understanding and addressing health and safety issues

- Ensure all candidate who select a design skill complete the additional documentation and that this is included in with their portfolio Evidence.

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 and uploaded to the LWT (if part of the sample) and stored in a secure place in the centre.

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. It is important that the candidates are clearly visible on the recording and that there is good sound quality, lighting should also be carefully considered when recording the work for moderation. Further details about the importance of the recording are available in the ASG document.

The majority of centres provided their recorded evidence on the LWT. In the vast majority of cases, recordings were clearly labelled with the group number and candidate number. Equally most recordings were of very good 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 full name and candidate number. Teachers must also clearly identify candidates on the CCIS Form. In 2022, 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 in the identification is the same as their appearance in the performance. 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, or partial recordings being uploaded to the LWT; 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. In 2022 due to the impact of the pandemic, some allowances were made to support centres, who had struggled to capture the final performance, or where design candidates had not been able to realise their final design concept. 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 could 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 in 2023 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.

In 2022, there was work produced from a range of design candidates; with lighting and costume being the most popular choices. There were some issues with the moderator not being able to clearly see 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.

Overall, 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. In 2022, there was an increase in candidates taking on the role of

lighting designer who did not meet the demands of the Specification and as a result their achievement was in the lower levels of the assessment criteria.

Best practice for the recording included:

- Clear, well-paced, introductions with candidates stating both their full 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 CCIS Forms with the centre identifying where in the candidate line up each candidate appears (is. Identified 1st/ 3rd), 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 (if these were in full costume)
- Work that was labelled with the group number and the candidate numbers so that this information matched the information on the CCIS forms and the LWT

General summative advice for centres, based on the 2022 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 or deadline
- Ensure candidates have the opportunity to conduct technical and dress rehearsals and to consider any health and safety risks or hazards.
- 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 with good quality visuals and sound
- Provide clear introductions by candidate name and number
- Ensure that clear descriptions are provided on the CCIS Form

Teacher - assessors must ensure that candidates adhere to the group sizes and timings for the Devised Performances in 2023 with the return to the full specification requirements with no adaptations:

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).

Where candidates (performance and design) do not meet the regulatory minimum performance requirement for AO2, marks awarded by the teacher - assessor **must be capped at level 2**, with a **maximum of 6 marks to be awarded**. There were no examples this year of candidates producing work below the regulatory timings, in part due to these being lowered due to the pandemic, and centres should be congratulated on how they have supported their lower achieving candidates in meeting the demands of the Specification.

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, these will be reinstated for 2023:

- 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, this is to ensure that there is parity for all candidates Nationally: the moderator will not consider any work after the maximum performance time.

Selection of sample for moderation

There was still some confusion in 2022 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 sent the work of all of their candidates, or they selected a sample that was not in line with the Specification requirements. In the 2019 series, the pre-selected sample was removed, and centres were required to send the work of their highest and lowest achieving candidate and a further sample of work (usually a maximum of 10 candidates work in total- dependent on your cohort size) from a maximum of 4 performance groups (although the maximum groups sent was flexible for centres due to the adaptation of monologues and duologues for 2022).

The teacher- assessor must select the sample after the internal assessment has taken place to reflect the overall mark range of the cohort. It was noted in 2022 that many more centres had thoroughly standardised the work of their candidates leading to more accurate marking. Pearson will not select the sample, 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 in 2023 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 few 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 few 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

In 2022, Centres had an adjustment to make in terms of administration with the introduction of the LWT platform and the new documentation that accompanies this new system. Centres worked hard to navigate the processes required to label and upload all work onto the new platform and to resolve any issues with the support of their moderator. It was noted by the moderating team, how excellent the communication was from centres in resolving any issues and providing all of the relevant work required. The use of the LWT and the new documentation will be reviewed and further streamlined to support both Centres and the moderating team in preparation for the 2023 series.

Most of the administration for Component 1 was completed accurately by centres and where errors occurred centres were generally very quick to resolve these issues. Centres do need to check the total mark accurately on the CCIS Forms and then transferred the total mark to Edexcel Online accurately. There was an increased number of cases in 2022, where moderators had to contact centres to check the Centre marks, as the mark on the CCIS Form did not match the marks on Edexcel Online. Errors in imputing the Centre's mark can impact the final mark that the Centre's candidates receive and as such all arithmetic must be carefully checked and all marks must be transferred accurately. It is the Centre's responsibility to contact Edexcel directly to make any amendments to the marks submitted, the moderator is not permitted to make these changes on the Centre's behalf.

Centres that placed their work in attainment order, from the highest achieving candidate to the lowest achieving candidate on the CCIS Form, clearly supported the moderation process. In 2022, there will be no requirement to complete the CCIS form for all candidates, only the sampled candidates will need to be included. The CCIS form will be one document per centre on Excel or Word, with the removal of the individual word CCIS forms for each candidate to further streamline the sampling process and minimise the workload for teacher assessors.

Centres are reminded that the teacher -assessor and the candidates must sign the NAS form to authenticate the work. The ASG details how the Portfolio Evidence should be presented for moderation and how documents should be labelled on the LWT. This guidance will be streamlined and updated in the Autumn Term to support centres with the 2023 series.

Centres are reminded that there is a coursework check sheet available on Pearson online that should be used to check all materials are uploaded to the LWT and should then be uploaded to the administration area. This is provided to support centres in ensuring that they have met all the requirements and included all of the materials required.

Several teacher-assessors provided detailed comments on the CCIS 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 was very supportive of the moderation process. Centres must ensure that they justify the marks that they have awarded, as this is a JCQ requirement. As such, centres must either annotate the candidates' Portfolio Evidence or write comments to justify the marks awarded on the CCIS Form. Some Centres in 2022 did not complete the comments on the CCIS Form or annotate the Portfolio Evidence as required.

Pearson Feedback and Support to Centres

Remark of Moderation

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 ROM 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 2022 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, a ROM 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 2022 series of the 9-1 GCSE specification and despite the adaptations and issues surrounding the pandemic, it is pleasing to note how hard centres have worked to understand the requirements of the specification and the national standard. 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 most centres is accurate in terms of the rank order of marks for candidates sampled and in placing the candidates in the correct levels for AO1, AO2 and AO4. The increase in internal standardisation has clearly supported teacher confidence in applying the assessment criteria accurately

and teachers have a much better grasp of the National Standard in 2022 than seen in previous years. A small proportion of teacher-assessors have struggled to accurately judge the level at which their candidates are working. This was particularly evident for 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 but have not been awarded appropriate for this.

Equally, at the top of the ability range, some teacher-assessors did not always accurately assess their candidates' work, over-rewarding achievement when compared to the National Standard. It appeared that some 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 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. In 2022, there was a mix in the calibre of work provided for moderation, with some candidates' performances being very unfocused or under-rehearsed due to the difficulties of the pandemic.

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 2022 commented that, in the vast majority of cases, GCSE Drama candidates were 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, despite the disruption of the pandemic.

Based on the 2022 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 in preparation for delivering 1DR0.01
- Make the most positive choice of stimuli material for each individual group of candidates/ classes/cohort - up to a maximum of 3 stimuli
- Ensure that the very best possible recordings are made and selected for moderation, with a total of 4 performance groups maximum
- 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