

Assessment Report

Scholarship, 2007

Drama

Drama, Scholarship, 2006

Commentary:

Candidates showed a high level of achievement in Parts 1 and 2 of the examination.

Familiarity with performance terminology and the elements of drama was, in most cases, sound, underpinning work of generally superior technical quality. Candidates were more severely tested in the impromptu performance and oral justification, calling for freshness and immediate creative insights.

Part 2, calling for impromptu performance linked to the prepared performance in Part 1, was read in more than one way by candidates. This did not impact on the quality of the evidence they produced of an ability to “integrate a comprehensive range of drama techniques”.

The best performing candidates most commonly demonstrated the following skills and / or knowledge:

- a thoroughly confident, uncontrived physical and vocal control of performance, especially in very challenging material
- very clear, specific and articulate analysis, presenting both overview and detail to the examiner
- originality and economy in devising work of significant theatricality
- overall breadth as well as depth of insight and practice
- superior understanding of effective use of the performance space
- bold and convincing choices in material, interpretation, and execution.

Candidates who did NOT achieve scholarship lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge above and in addition they:

- selected roles which offered sparse / limited opportunities to display their personal skills and strengths
- expanded on technical detail in explanation of their work without indicating their purpose and intention
- failed to engage the anticipated audience by lack of intensity or directness in their approach.