

GCE Performing Arts

Subject Guidance for Summer 2022

Unit AS 1: Developing Skills and Repertoire
Exceptional Assessment Adaptations for Summer 2022



GCE Performing Arts

Unit AS 1: Developing Skills and Repertoire

Exceptional Assessment Adaptations for 2021–2022

1. Introduction

On 17 May 2021 the Education Minister, Peter Weir MLA, announced a return to public examinations during the next academic year, along with significant reductions in the assessment requirements across a range of CCEA qualifications.

In a number of subjects at both AS and A Level, he announced that internal assessment tasks would be reduced rather than a unit being omitted. This document sets out these changes to GCE Performing Arts Unit AS 1: Developing Skills and Repertoire for Summer 2022 only emanating from this decision.

The total marks available for this task will be 60. The unit will continue to carry a weighting of 60% of AS/24% of A Level.

2. Task Requirements for Summer 2022

This unit will be internally assessed and externally moderated.

Students will work in groups of between two and nine and/or individually.

Each student must produce a portfolio of work consisting of a summary of research and skills audit, a record of work, a risk assessment, a recording of a performance or presentation, and an evaluation. Assessment adaptations for the relevant tasks are detailed in the table below.

Content	Marks
<p>Summary of Research and Skills Audit Students will only be assessed in <u>Section 2</u> of the Summary of Research and the <u>Skills Audit</u>. Assessment of Section 1 and Section 3 of the Summary of Research has been removed.</p> <p><i>Summary of Research Section 2 – a maximum of 1 word-processed side of A4 paper.</i> <i>Skills Audit – a maximum of 2 word-processed sides of A4 paper.</i></p>	12
<p>Record of Work Students will select only <u>one</u> existing extract of repertoire. Students <u>will not</u> be required to select a second contrasting extract of repertoire.</p> <p><i>A maximum of 5 word-processed sides of A4 paper.</i></p>	28
<p>Risk Assessment - To be assessed as normal, as per the specification.</p> <p><i>A maximum of 1 word-processed side of A4 paper.</i></p>	4
<p>Performance or Presentation Students will produce a recording of a performance or presentation that includes three stages of skills development for their <u>one</u> chosen extract of repertoire. Students <u>will not</u> be required to produce a recording or presentation of a second contrasting extract of repertoire.</p> <p><i>The recording for each student should last between 5-10 minutes.</i></p>	10
<p>Evaluation - To be assessed as normal, as per the specification.</p> <p><i>A maximum of 3 word-processed sides of A4 paper.</i></p>	6
Total marks	60

3. Further Advice and Information

If you require further information, please contact:

CCEA Helpline	helpline@ccea.org.uk Telephone: 028 9026 1220
Subject Officer	Katie Smith kasmith@ccea.org.uk
Specification Support Officer	Nola Fitzsimons nfitzsimons@ccea.org.uk
CCEA Entries	entriesandresults@ccea.org.uk

4. Unit AS 1: Developing Skills and Repertoire Assessment Criteria for 2022

Appendix 2

Assessment Criteria and Mark Bands for Unit AS 1: Developing Skills and Repertoire

Candidates need to produce a portfolio comprising:

- (a) a summary of research (*section 2 only*) and skills audit (AO1, 12 marks);
- (b) a record of work (*based on 1 extract only*) (AO2, 28 marks);
- (c) (i) a risk assessment (AO3, 4 marks); and
(ii) a recording of performance/presentation (*based on 1 extract only*) (AO3, 10 marks); and
- (d) an evaluation (AO4, 6 marks).

There are 60 marks available for this unit. Award 0 for work that is not worthy of credit.

For further guidance on marking and internal standardisation, please refer to Section 6 of this specification.

	Mark Band 1: Basic Candidates' work shows:	Mark Band 2: Satisfactory Candidates' work shows:	Mark Band 3: Good Candidates' work shows:	Mark Band 4: Excellent Candidates' work shows:
AO1 (a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • limited evidence of relevant research into the skills required for the chosen discipline; • a basic undeveloped skills audit with few ideas on their current skill level and only basic information on their experience to date; and • quality of written communication that is basic. <p style="text-align: right;">[1–3]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sufficient evidence of relevant research into the skills required for the chosen discipline; • a relevant, but not developed, skills audit with some ideas on their current skill level and only moderate information on their experience to date; and • quality of written communication that is satisfactory. <p style="text-align: right;">[4–6]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ample evidence of relevant research into the skills required for the chosen discipline; • a detailed and developed skills audit with realistic ideas on their current skill level and significant information on their experience to date; and • quality of written communication that is good. <p style="text-align: right;">[7–9]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • comprehensive evidence of relevant research into the skills required for the chosen discipline; • a comprehensive and fully developed skills audit with perceptive ideas on their current skill level and precise information on their experience to date; and • quality of written communication that is excellent. <p style="text-align: right;">[10–12]</p>

Assessment Criteria and Mark Bands for Unit AS 1: Developing Skills and Repertoire (cont.)

	Mark Band 1: Basic Candidates' work shows:	Mark Band 2: Satisfactory Candidates' work shows:	Mark Band 3: Good Candidates' work shows:	Mark Band 4: Excellent Candidates' work shows:
AO2 (b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • basic and incomplete research of the social, cultural and historical context of an extract of repertoire; • superficial action plan with little evidence of understanding how to manage themselves and work with others; • evidence of practice, using only basic skills and techniques, that shows little progression and minimal development of a personal style; • basic awareness of their own strengths and weaknesses; and • quality of written communication that is basic. <p style="text-align: right;">[1–7]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • some research of the social, cultural and historical context of an extract of repertoire, which may be uneven; • relevant action plan with some understanding of self-management and working with others; • evidence of practice, using some relevant skills and techniques, that shows some progression and moderate development of a personal style; • recognition of some of their own strengths and weaknesses; and • quality of written communication that is satisfactory. <p style="text-align: right;">[8–14]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • detailed research of the social, cultural and historical context of an extract of repertoire; • clear and detailed action plan showing understanding of self-management and working with others; • evidence of practice, using a range of relevant skills and techniques, that shows significant progression and the creative development of a personal style; • clear consideration of their own strengths and weaknesses; and • quality of written communication that is good. <p style="text-align: right;">[15–21]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • comprehensive research of the social, cultural and historical context of an extract of repertoire; • fully developed action plan reflecting thorough understanding of self-management and working with others; • evidence of practice, using a wide range of relevant skills and techniques, that shows sustained progression and highly creative development of a personal style; • insightful recognition and consideration of their own strengths and weaknesses; and • quality of written communication that is excellent. <p style="text-align: right;">[22–28]</p>
For a detailed explanation of the mark bands for the quality of written communication, see Section 4 of the specification.				

Assessment Criteria and Mark Bands for Unit AS 1: Developing Skills and Repertoire (cont.)

	Mark Band 1: Basic Candidates' work shows:	Mark Band 2: Satisfactory Candidates' work shows:	Mark Band 3: Good Candidates' work shows:	Mark Band 4: Excellent Candidates' work shows:
AO3 (c)(i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a basic risk assessment that accounts for one or two hazards and presents only basic ideas for risk reduction using research as guidance; • quality of written communication that is basic. <p style="text-align: right;">[1]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a relevant risk assessment that accounts for more than two hazards and presents appropriate ideas for risk reduction with some evidence of the use of research to inform outcomes; • quality of written communication that is satisfactory. <p style="text-align: right;">[2]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a clearly developed risk assessment that accounts for significant hazards and presents effective ideas for risk reduction using research to inform outcomes; • quality of written communication that is good. <p style="text-align: right;">[3]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a comprehensive risk assessment that accounts for all hazards and presents perceptive ideas for risk reduction using research innovatively to inform outcomes; • quality of written communication that is excellent. <p style="text-align: right;">[4]</p>
AO3 (c)(ii)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a performance/presentation of an extract of repertoire with inconsistent use of skills and basic communication of meaning; • minimal awareness of the technical/aesthetic requirements; and • insufficient understanding of professional practice. <p style="text-align: right;">[1–2]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a performance/presentation of an extract of repertoire with relevant use of skills and some communication of meaning; • some awareness of the technical/aesthetic requirements; and • adequate understanding of professional practice. <p style="text-align: right;">[3–5]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a performance/presentation of an extract of repertoire with confident use of skills and effective communication of meaning; • clear awareness of the technical/aesthetic requirements; and • secure understanding of professional practice. <p style="text-align: right;">[6–8]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a performance/presentation of an extract of repertoire with creative use of skills and engaging and insightful communication of meaning; • highly developed awareness of the technical/aesthetic requirements; and • thorough understanding of professional practice. <p style="text-align: right;">[9–10]</p>
For a detailed explanation of the mark bands for the quality of written communication, see Section 4 of the specification.				

Assessment Criteria and Mark Bands for Unit AS 1: Developing Skills and Repertoire (cont.)

	Mark Band 1: Basic Candidates' work shows:	Mark Band 2: Satisfactory Candidates' work shows:	Mark Band 3: Good Candidates' work shows:	Mark Band 4: Excellent Candidates' work shows:
AO4 (d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a superficial peer assessment with limited analysis of the aesthetic and technical quality of the performance or product and basic reference to the overall impact on the audience; • a basic self-assessment with limited analysis of the aesthetic and technical quality of the performance or product and basic reference to the overall impact for the audience, supported with minimal examples; • limited identification of ideas for further development and target setting for the future; and • quality of written communication that is basic. <p style="text-align: right;">[1]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an appropriate peer assessment that analyses some of the aesthetic and technical quality of the performance or product with moderate reference to the overall impact on the audience; • a relevant self-assessment that analyses some of the aesthetic and technical quality of the performance or product with moderate reference to the overall impact for the audience, supported with some practical examples; • some identification of ideas for further development and target setting for the future; and • quality of written communication that is satisfactory. <p style="text-align: right;">[2–3]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a detailed peer assessment that clearly analyses the aesthetic and technical quality of the performance or product with effective reference to the overall impact on the audience; • a clear and realistic self-assessment that clearly analyses the aesthetic and technical quality of the performance or product with significant reference to the overall impact for the audience, supported with detailed practical examples; • effective identification of ideas for further development and target setting for the future; and • quality of written communication that is good. <p style="text-align: right;">[4–5]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a comprehensive peer assessment that fully analyses the aesthetic and technical quality of the performance or product with insightful reference to the overall impact on the audience; • a perceptive self-assessment that critically analyses the aesthetic and technical quality of the performance or product with precise reference to the overall impact for the audience, supported with carefully selected practical examples; • insightful identification of ideas for further development and focused target setting for the future; and • quality of written communication that is excellent. <p style="text-align: right;">[6]</p>
<p>* For a detailed explanation of the mark bands for the quality of written communication, see Section 4 of the specification.</p>				