

# 2015 NZ Scholarship Assessment Report

## Drama

### Part A: Commentary

Candidates used a wide range of source material for prepared interpretation and reached a reasonable level of competency in analysing their own performance intentions. Reference to broad theatre practice was frequently evident.

Aspects of the examination which tested candidates significantly, were the application of general performance theory to create compelling work within the required framework and the establishment of a strongly personal presence for all three questions.

### Part B: Report on performance standard

<b>Scholarship with Outstanding Performance</b>	<p>Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>used high level critical thinking in addresses to the camera. For example, comment about the wider implications of the Part 1 excerpt rather than the bare bones of its given circumstances, allowed students to show deeper analytical ability</li> <li>showed consistently fresh insights in performance choices, especially where a classic text was used. The imaginative approach was compatible with the text as a whole</li> <li>applied consistently superior technical skills to achieve forceful drama. For example vocal flexibility and modulation supported the translation of widely differing material into perceptive drama.</li> </ul>
<b>Scholarship</b>	<p>Candidates who were awarded Scholarship commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provided convincing explanations of their devising and performance choices. For example, a candidate whose devised material demonstrated Brechtian theory, clarified accurately a range of appropriate applications of Brecht's ideas and carried them out competently</li> <li>created valid and technically sound interpretations for all sections of the paper. For example, the stated intention of the introduction was clearly adhered to for Parts 1 and 2. For Part 3a credible drama was developed</li> <li>applied general drama theory competently. For example, the performance space was sensitively and effectively used to support dramatic intention.</li> </ul>
<b>Other candidates</b>	<p>Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>evidenced little awareness of performance opportunities or character detail in their prepared material. For example, lack of pausing to allow pivotal moments to be absorbed, had a disengaging effect</li> <li>restricted justifications so that their ability to critically analyse in an articulate way was reduced. For example an introduction which simply stated the sourcing of piece for Part 1, without expanding to include intentions for an audience or performance choices beyond movement, missed an opportunity to show the candidate's understanding of performance</li> <li>lacked credible performance skills, especially in an adequate vocal range and controlled physicality. For example, thoughts not reflected in the breath, body or movement of a candidate compromised belief in that character.</li> </ul>

<b>Standard specific comments</b>	<p>The requirement of the standard for candidates to maintain a very high level of proficiency across all performances and justifications provided a significant challenge where choices were not conveyed in detail and with some degree of originality.</p> <p>For example, candidates who learned explanations for Part 1 word for word, reduced their opportunity to demonstrate articulate personal conviction.</p> <p>Similarly, those who used banal or superficial or clichéd interpretation and techniques in any question, were unable to achieve at a high level.</p> <p>Annotation of scripts did not constitute primary evidence for the candidate or replace the oral justification for Parts 1 and 2, although it confirmed the perspective and intention to be enacted.</p>
-----------------------------------	---