

## Drama SIL

### Checklist:

- Complete redraft of Section 2 coursework – put together with your redrafted Section 1 as a 3000 word document
- Check your reflective report – have you completed your redraft of both Extract 1 and 2? Put these together as a 2000 word document
- Research **at least** one of the following practitioners for Extract 3: Frantic Assembly, DV8, Berkoff, Punchdrunk
- Have a lovely Summer ☺

### Mark scheme for the Reflective Report (20 marks)

#### **Band 5: 17–20**

**Assured and perceptive** analysis and evaluation referring in precise detail to their theatrical interpretation of all three extracts.  
Compelling and fluently structured.

#### **Band 4: 13–16**

**Focused and considered** analysis and evaluation referring in detail to their theatrical interpretation of all three extracts.  
Detailed and well structured.

#### **Band 3: 9–12**

**Straightforward and pertinent** analysis and evaluation referring in detail in places to their theatrical interpretation of all three extracts.  
Relevant with some structure.

#### **Band 2: 5–8**

**Generalised** analysis and evaluation referring in limited detail to their theatrical interpretation of all three extracts.  
Lacking in clarity of expression and organisation.

#### **Band 1: 1–4**

**Little relevant** analysis and evaluation referring in negligible detail to their theatrical

interpretation of all three extracts.  
Unclear and disorganised.

**Proposed Essay Structure:**

<p><b>Opportunities and Challenges (600 words)</b> Briefly introduce the extract, and its context within the play. What opportunities does the text provide in terms of theatrical interpretation? What are the challenges of interpreting the extract? Pick out key moments and analyse where opportunities were created for dramatic potential, and where you hit challenges in developing character and meaning.</p>	<p>Extract 1 – 200 words Extract 2 – 200 words Extract 3 – 200 words Discuss any links between extracts – differences / similarities?</p>
<p><b>Genre and style, and how this was interpreted (600)</b> What is the genre and style of the play and extract? How did you interpret the extract and character? Was this in keeping with its intended style / genre? How? Did you interpret any sections differently? How? Why? Pick out specific moments and talk in detail about how you interpreted these in terms of style and genre</p>	<p>Extract 1 – 200 words Extract 2 – 200 words Extract 3 – 200 words Discuss any links between extracts – differences / similarities?</p>
<p><b>Social, cultural, political, historical context (600)</b> What is the play’s social, cultural, political, historical background? What time period was it set in? What was the political scene at the time? Any cultural / historical factors that affect the play? How did these factors influence your interpretation? (For example, if the play is set in Thatcherite Britain, how did you evoke a sense of the lack of hope felt by the working class?)</p>	<p>Extract 1 – 200 words Extract 2 – 200 words Extract 3 – 200 words Discuss any links between extracts – differences / similarities?</p>
<p><b>Practitioner application (600)</b></p>	<p>Extract 1 – 200 words Extract 2 – 200 words Extract 3 – 200 words</p>

<p>Briefly introduce Stanislavskian theory (Extract 1 and 2) and Berkoffian theory (Extract 3)</p> <p>Which aspects of this practitioner's theory and methodology did you apply to the extract? How? Why?</p> <p>Pick out clear examples and explain how you applied your knowledge of the practitioner.</p> <p>How did this affect your interpretation of the character and extract?</p>	<p>Discuss any links between extracts – differences / similarities?</p>
<p><b>Success in communicating meaning / realising intentions in exploration (600)</b></p> <p>Following the exploration / rehearsal period, how successful were you in realising your aims and communicating meaning in your final interpretation?</p>	<p>Extract 1 – 200 words</p> <p>Extract 2 – 200 words</p> <p>Extract 3 – 200 words</p> <p>Discuss any links between extracts – differences / similarities?</p>

### Working Notebook Mark Scheme:

Band	Marks	Descriptor
4	16-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanations given in the Working notebook evidence excellent skills in creating and developing ideas to communicate meaning through devising.</li> <li>• Evidence of a very sensitive and highly creative response to the stimulus.</li> <li>• Evidence of full development and refinement of skills and the piece.</li> <li>• Precise details are provided throughout.</li> <li>• Structure and reasoning is logical and systematic.</li> <li>• Responses make perceptive connections between dramatic theory and practice.</li> </ul>
3	11-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanations given in the Working notebook evidence good skills in creating and developing ideas to communicate meaning through devising</li> <li>• Evidence of a fully engaged response to the stimulus, demonstrating strong creativity.</li> <li>• Evidence of a good degree of development and refinement of skills and the piece.</li> <li>• A number of precise details are provided.</li> <li>• Structure and reasoning is clear and consistent.</li> <li>• Responses make considered connections between dramatic theory and practice.</li> </ul>
2	6-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanations given in the Working notebook evidence reasonable skills in creating and developing ideas to communicate meaning through devising.</li> <li>• Evidence of creative engagement with the stimulus.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of some useful development and refinement of skills and the piece.</li> <li>• Only some details are given and/or details may lack precision.</li> <li>• Structure and reasoning is present but not always clear.</li> <li>• Responses make some useful connections between dramatic theory and practice.</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<b>1-5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanations given in the Working notebook evidence limited skills in creating and developing ideas to communicate meaning through devising.</li> <li>• Evidence of a predictable response to the stimulus.</li> <li>• Lack of evidence regarding development and refinement of skills.</li> <li>• Only some details are given and/or details may lack precision.</li> <li>• There is little or no structure or reasoning present.</li> <li>• Responses make only generalised connections between dramatic theory and practice.</li> </ul>

## **Section 2: Development and Refinement**

### **Devising approach:**

- How did you begin to approach key scenes? What changes did you make to scenes and key moments? How did you develop and refine scenes? Pick out at least three different scene examples and explain and analyse changes made (or if it's a scene you've not mentioned in Section 1, explain how you created it). Remember to analyse everything!
- How did scenes evolve? How were scenes changed and developed? Remember to link theory and practise and justify changes made, linking back to both your given practitioner and any research undertaken

### **Development and refinement of skill:**

- How was the acting refined and developed as the piece evolved?

### **Comparison with initial aims and intentions:**

- How does your final piece reflect your original aims and intentions? How much did these change throughout the theatre-making process? What do you want the audience to think, feel and understand?