

T A S M A N I A N

S E C O N D A R Y

A S S E S S M E N T

B O A R D

SD865/875

Drama/Performance

2001 External Examination Report



SD865 Drama Stage 5

Practical

Choice of material was a concern in some schools/colleges. Pieces chosen purely for their shock value on issues such as rape, murder, homosexuality, number of four letter words etc. often disadvantaged the students. Frequently the only words spoken expressively or with meaning were the swear words! The panel felt that on occasions the subject matter and choice of language had not been understood by the candidate.

Plays – many choices were excellent, but there were some which did not provide sufficient ensemble playing opportunities for all candidates. Teachers must ensure that students are given every opportunity to show character development and interaction within the choice of play.

Poetry/Prose/Monologue – students who chose to undertake a monologue and then performed their poetry or prose **over dramatically** were presenting the panel with 3 dramatic pieces, and clearly not showing the range or understanding of the differing forms necessary for an SA award. The poetry and prose selections must be presented with clarity with the student using only the **face and voice to convey the meaning**. Moving around the room, leaping and employing over exaggerated gestures is not appropriate to the presentation of poetry and prose. There will be further discussion and consultation with all teachers regarding the inclusion of the monologue from 2003.

Running orders need to be correct and pieces in the folder for the panel must be arranged in order. It is very distracting for the performer and panel if assessors are searching for the correct piece once the student has started. Where paragraphs and stanzas have been edited, they should be marked clearly on the original. Sometimes it was obvious that even the teacher was unaware of the edits. Selections requiring numerous edits should not have been chosen in the first place.

Paraphrasing – we saw so much of it. Students need to be made aware that this will result in a diminution of their award. Often where students had typed up their own copy for the examiners they deleted lines and key words from poems, thus materially affecting the integrity and rhythm of the piece. Copies of literary pieces must be photocopied from original sources. There was a significant increase in mispronunciation of words: 'liddle' (little), 'somethink', 'nothink'.

Time limits for programs must be strictly adhered to, e.g. 5 minutes (maximum) for a solo program and 15 minutes for drama (a group of three).

Teachers are advised that they must use the correct cover sheet and documentation from the TASSAB website when compiling folders.

SD865 Written Paper

This section caused problems for some students in as much as the production they undertook, whether scripted or experimental, could not be fully addressed in the questions. The questions limited the students and so the majority only wrote in depth on one or two parts. It was pleasing that in most cases the students made constant reference to their production and were able to articulate the process and provide examples.

Section A**Question 2**

The restriction to only two criteria to be discussed proved a problem for many candidates who seem to have been expecting to write about a number more and so were ill-prepared to write about only two in any detail. Many resorted to filling out the essay with a detailed discussion of themes – apparently another prepared answer, but one which, in this instance, had little bearing on the topic.

The result was that a significant number of candidates were unable to adapt their prepared information to the topic and so were less able to indicate their appreciation of the productions they had seen.

A major difficulty for many lay in their ability to describe, but not analyse, productions they had seen. From the general prevalence of this problem, it would seem that a concerted effort by teachers to ensure that students understand the difference between description and analysis and to concentrate on the latter is of some urgency.

Spelling of theatre terminology was once again a problem for many: ‘scence’ for ‘scene’, amature’ for ‘amateur’, ‘directored’ for ‘directed’ and various versions of ‘characterisation’.

Section B**Question 4**

This question was a challenge as many students could easily write about the technical elements, but found it difficult to fully explain the background research and style. Many realised that it was a process question and wrote at length about the development of the production while making little reference to the three dot points.

Question 5

This question was answered well, although a great deal of the productions included short sharp scenes and it was difficult for the candidates to write at length and in depth about two contrasting scenes. Pace and dramatic action were challenging concepts for candidates, although many managed the other two dot points quite well.

Question 6

This question was a major challenge as it had so many parts to it and was possibly a little ambiguous. Students were challenged when there was not one major character in their production, and where in classroom reality, the directors had clearly given equal parts to all cast members. Students found it impossible to address the last part of the question, ‘change in the character over the course of the performance’, and wrote more about the character in

rehearsal to performance. It was evident that strong candidates attempted this question, and as in all questions the degree of difficulty was taken into account by the assessors.

SD875 Performance Stage 5

Teachers are clearly ignoring the time guidelines for assessment in this syllabus. The rules/guidelines which are published in the Guidelines for Assessment documents are to be **strictly** observed. **In future examiners will cease assessment after the allocated time.** In some cases students being assessed had not appeared on stage until well after the 2 1/2 hour time allocation. It is the responsibility of the teacher to time the production accurately well in advance and make adjustments and not leave it until the final rehearsal to realise that the production is running well over time. Some students were clearly stressed by this misjudgment on the part of the teacher. In the event of this happening the future, TASSAB will be notified and adjustments to the students' awards will be made.

Productions/scripts which present monologues and duologues with little ensemble opportunity continue to disadvantage students – some of whom are clearly quite competent.

Monologues – if monologues clearly require an American, English, Irish or regional accent then this must be utilised. The pieces make little sense when presented in a broad Australian accent as there is no context. If the student cannot cope with such a demand, then an alternative should be found.

Monologues from the internet or copied from monologues anthologies where the student had clearly not read the full script and consequently had no idea of the context of the monologue was very evident in the performance. The monologue must be from a **published dramatic text** and **photocopied from the original**. Incorrectly typed copies are not acceptable. The literary quality of the work, its source and context, should be overseen and endorsed by the teacher.

Candidates who are entered for SD865 with TASSAB, must not be presented for assessment in SD875 productions. This occurred in one school, and the student was assessed, but in the future, this will not occur.

Names on all official documents should **accurately** correspond to the name the candidate has used to register with TASSAB. It is difficult to identify a student called 'Rebecca' when she is called 'Beccy' in her journal, and 'Bec' on her performance cover sheet!

SD875 candidates must be clearly identified in the list of cast members, as should those **not** being assessed. At some centres the cast lists were confusion, and it was only by panel members asking why particular candidates were not being assessed that these errors were picked up.

Work which may have been previously assessed, must **not** be reworked as part of the end of year examination process. A new work must form the basis of the assessment.

Teachers are reminded that journals must be received **30 minutes** before the production commences. Journals, or part thereof, received later will **not** be assessed. Journals which are not signed by both the student and teacher will also not be assessed. Work which has been clearly plagiarised from any source must not be included in the journal. It is the responsibility of both student and teacher to ensure the originality of the written work presented.

SD875 – (some scripts and collections presented in 2001)

Still Waters – a collection of Terrence Rattigan plays

Cosi

The Enquiry

The Maids

Mother Figure, Drinking Companion, A Chorus of Disapproval – (Aychbourn)

Mary, Mary

Season at Sarsaparilla

Top Girls

Stepping Out

This Old Man Came Rolling Home

SD865

Remains to Be Seen

The Boys

Stags & Hens

The Importance of Being Earnest

Pillars of the Community

Three Young Ladies in a Temper

Cosi

Failing from Grace

Radiance

Equus

Lunch Girls

The Crucible

Bold Girls

Down Town

Hotel Sorrento

Agnes of God

The Club

A Marriage Proposal

Brilliant Lies

The Removalists

Summer of the Seventeenth Doll

Lettice & Lovage

Absent Friends

Pygmalion

Once Jolly Jumbuck

After Dinner 'Business

Secret Bridesmaid's Business

Cahoots

Absurd Person Singular

Impromptu (Mozel)

A Woman of No Importance

The Chocolate Frog

Cecily

Me and My Friends

Valley Forgery
Shakers
Dinner Date
Summer of the 17th Doll
In Camera
The American Dream

All correspondence should be addressed to:

Tasmanian Secondary Assessment Board
PO Box 147, Sandy Bay 7006
Ph: (03) 6233 6364 Fax: (03) 6224 0175

Email: reception@tassab.tased.edu.au
Internet: <http://www.tassab.tased.edu.au>