Level 1 / Level 2 Examiners' Report

Performing Arts
Level 1 / 2 (Technical Award)
January 2025

Introduction

Our Principal Examiners' report provides valuable feedback on the recent assessment series. It has been written by our Principal Examiners and Principal Moderators after the completion of marking and moderation, and details how candidates have performed in each component.

This report opens with a summary of candidates' performance, including the assessment objectives / skills / topics / themes being tested, and highlights the characteristics of successful performance and where performance could be improved. It then looks in detail at each unit, pinpointing aspects that proved challenging to some candidates and suggesting some reasons as to why that might be.[1]

The information found in this report provides valuable insight for practitioners to support their teaching and learning activity. We would also encourage practitioners to share this document – in its entirety or in part – with their learners to help with exam preparation, to understand how to avoid pitfalls and to add to their revision toolbox.

Further support

Document	Description	Link
Professional Learning / CPD	WJEC offers an extensive programme of online and face-to-face Professional Learning events. Access interactive feedback, review example candidate responses, gain practical ideas for the classroom and put questions to our dedicated team by registering for one of our events here.	https://www.wjec.co.uk/home/professional-learning/ / https://www.eduqas.co.uk/home/professional-learning/
Past papers	Access the bank of past papers for this qualification, including the most recent assessments. Please note that we do not make past papers available on the public website until 12 months after the examination.	Portal by WJEC or on the WJEC/Eduqas subject page
Grade boundary information	Grade boundaries are the minimum number of marks needed to achieve each grade. For unitised specifications grade boundaries are expressed on a Uniform Mark Scale (UMS). UMS grade boundaries remain the same every year as the range of UMS mark percentages allocated to a particular grade does not change. UMS grade boundaries are published at overall subject and component level. For linear specifications, a single grade is awarded for the subject, rather than for each component that contributes towards the overall grade. Grade boundaries are published on results day.	For unitised specifications click here: Results, Grade Boundaries and PRS (wjec.co.uk) / Results and Grade Boundaries and PRS (eduqas.co.uk)

---

[1] *Please note that where overall performance on a question/question part was considered good, with no particular areas to highlight, these questions have not been included in the report.*

Exam Results Analysis	WJEC provides information to examination centres via the WJEC Portal. This is restricted to centre staff only. Access is granted to centre staff by the Examinations Officer at the centre.	Portal by WJEC
Classroom Resources	Access our extensive range of FREE classroom resources, including blended learning materials, exam walk-throughs and knowledge organisers to support teaching and learning.	https://resources.wjec.co.uk/ / https://resources.eduqas.co.uk/
Bank of Professional Learning materials	Access our bank of Professional Learning materials from previous events from our portal and additional pre-recorded materials available in the public domain.	Portal by WJEC or on the WJEC/Eduqas subject page.
Become an examiner with WJEC.	We are always looking to recruit new examiners or moderators. These opportunities can provide you with valuable insight into the assessment process, enhance your skill set, increase your understanding of your subject and inform your teaching.	Become an Examiner | WJEC / Become an Examiner | Eduqas

Contents

Executive Summary

Overall, centres and candidates are responding well to the demands of the qualification, it is clear to see candidates' enjoyment of creating and performing work across a range of disciplines. As centres are becoming more confident with the specification, there is an increase in candidates taking real ownership of the work and being encouraged to present work in a format which best suits them.

Although the majority of the work seen was from Acting / Devised Drama and Music / Composition options, there was a growing number of Musical Theatre / Choreography and Music Technology submissions.

It was pleasing to see a range of creative responses to the different briefs, where candidates achieved well in both units, there was a real sense of how they were inspired by the brief throughout all of their tasks.

At the highest levels, performance work was engaging for an audience, with a sense of coherency and commitment evident. Research at this level was effective and pertinent to what candidates were doing and clearly linked to the brief. Candidates demonstrated a clear engagement in the process, supporting evidence was clear and the use of terminology and techniques was convincing. There was a strong sense of the impact of the rehearsal / creating process at this level.

Across the lower mark ranges, there was a sense of journey emerging, and candidates had often attempted all of the tasks, although they were not fully explored or completed. Subject specific language and terminology was generally limited. Within this range, candidates were starting to show some understanding of what they wanted to achieve, however, they were often unable to articulate this well or fully evidence this in their final outcome.

It is important throughout the tasks that candidates are demonstrating their understanding of their chosen discipline and referring to specific terminology linked to this. In many cases, production candidates, particularly ones working in a group with performance candidates, often made little reference to their chosen production skill, instead using the development logs to consider the creation of the actual performance.

Where candidates achieved well in the practical tasks, there was a real sense of ownership of the work, it was clear how their research, initial intentions and influences had been realised in practice. Centres are reminded that where candidates work in groups, there should be clear evidence of what they have individually contributed.

A number of centres had used scaffolds for candidates to structure their work, these were more successful when they used the bullet points from the criteria as prompts. Very rigid templates, particularly for research and evaluation tasks, often restricted candidates to one or two word responses, which did not allow them to go into enough depth to access the higher mark bands.

Key points

- Centres are reminded that the submission deadline for all units for Summer 2025 is 5th May.

- If entering candidates for the overall qualification in Summer 2025 then candidates must be entered for aggregation (cash in) in addition to the individual units. Further details can be found in section 6 of the specification.

- Centres may find it useful to sign up for our [centre networking map](#), this allows registered centres to network with each other, share resources and seek support for moderation purposes.

Areas for improvement	Classroom resources	Brief description of resource
Use of subject specific vocabulary	KEY VOCABULARY	Definitions of key vocabulary
Use of subject specific practical skills	SKILLS AUDIT	Initial audit of skills level

PERFORMING ARTS

Level 1 / Level 2

January 2025

Unit 1 Performing

Overview of the Component

This unit is intended to establish good working practices for candidates to recreate a piece of existing repertoire. Candidates consolidate their performance skills, learning how to prepare for a performance from the initial research stages through to evaluating their final outcome, thus preparing them to enter the Performing Arts industries. Candidates can select from Acting, Music, Music Technology or Musical Theatre options. Musical Theatre candidates must demonstrate their skills in at least two disciplines from singing, acting and dancing, although these do not need to be of equal weighting. Candidates should not be choreographing their own material, this unit is about how they learn and interpret existing material. It is acceptable for teachers to choreograph a routine in an appropriate style for the chosen musical, which is then taught to candidates. While the majority of work seen this series was from Acting and Music submissions, there has been a significant increase in Musical Theatre submissions, with the number of Music Technology submissions also starting to increase. The number of male candidates submitting Musical Theatre performances is increasing and it is encouraging to see that candidates are being supported to explore their own interests through this unit, with some centres enabling different disciplines in the same cohort to suit the different skills of the candidates. Centres are reminded that candidates should be assessed under the Music criteria if they are singing a song from a piece of Musical Theatre but not demonstrating multiple skills. Centres are reminded that for Musical Theatre submissions, candidates are unable to achieve above band 3 for Task 4 if they have not demonstrated at least two Musical Theatre skills. These do not have to be equally weighted, the second skill just has to be present.

Centres are reminded that there is a brief for this unit, this does not change for the lifetime of the specification. If centres have candidates who are resitting the unit, contact should be made with the Subject Officer for further guidance around the brief. Candidates should be referring to how their choices meet the requirements of the Whittingborn Festival, this will most likely be done in Task 1 when they are considering their choices of repertoire. Some centres made this a big focus throughout the tasks, for example when candidates were performing their work, it had been set up as an audition for the festival, with teachers taking on the role of the panel. While we encourage candidates to select material to perform that allows them to explore their interests, centres are reminded that they need to consider professional standards and consider the appropriateness of the language and theme of the pieces being selected. Some Acting and Music entries this series contained a number of expletives or focused on very adult themes. Centres are advised that it is acceptable to consider the 'radio edit' approach to adapting text to ensure it is suitable for the age range of the candidates. This can be discussed by candidates as part of Task 1a and 1b.

Where candidates have achieved well in this unit, they have understood that for a performance to be successful, it is first necessary to consider the background and context for the piece, along with their own skill level. They have demonstrated how they developed their performance, exploring it, researching the context of its origin and how it was developed and using that knowledge to develop a performance that fits their context (age, contextual environment and brief). In successful responses, candidates have described the journey they have taken with their performance, from initial watching or listening, deconstructing individual components to learn, exploring the elements of their discipline to be able to deliver a polished performance. They have then demonstrated that they can evaluate their performance, reviewing this critically and constructively and responding to feedback from their audience.

General performance across the unit has been consistent with previous series. Task 4 (the performance presentation) continues to be the most successful and accurately marked, as this is core to teaching colleagues experiences. It remains that the supporting evidence, specifically tasks 1 and 5, that still present most challenge to candidates. This is fundamentally because responses often failed to examine the specific performance piece using discipline specific concepts and elements and use the appropriate terminology to describe what candidates were doing and how. Accounts were often vague and lacked specificity. Candidates can research the wider context of their chosen extract if this helps to put it into context, but the focus should be on their specific extract, song, piece of music etc.

To ensure the qualification is accessible for different candidates, it was encouraging to see a range of approaches to submissions, including vlogs and narrated PowerPoints to support candidates to express themselves in a format most suitable for them. A number of centres have given candidates the option of using scaffolded writing frames to support the development of Tasks 1, 2, 3 and 5. Where this has been done well, candidates use these as guides to write in prose or use them as prompts adding more detail verbally to narrated PowerPoints or video responses. It must be mentioned that often, the scaffolding given to candidates is very rigid and leads to short responses or one or two word answers. While this may be appropriate to use to support candidates to give a response rather than nothing at all, they do not include the depth and detail required to achieve the higher bands. Rather than scaffolding which requires a closed answer, candidates should be encouraged to discuss or describe their work using discipline terminology and concepts. Where centres feel it is useful to give prompts, then making use of the bullet points from the criteria for each task are often the most helpful here.

Comments on individual questions / sections

Task 1a and 1b
Outline the findings of the research you have undertaken for your chosen piece(s).
Discuss how this research will influence your performance and what impact you are
hoping to achieve.

Where candidates have had real ownership of choices, this was generally reflected in the way they have been able to reflect on the piece(s) of repertoire. Where centres have selected the repertoire, for example the same play text or musical, then it is still important for candidates to consider why it is has been chosen, for example have they been given a choice in selecting the scene they will do or the character they play? This will allow them to give rationale and context. High-level responses to this task demonstrated a real understanding of the chosen repertoire, for example the context of the extract within the larger scale piece, where it was originally performed, target audience etc. To consider their own intentions successfully in Task 1b, through Task 1a candidates need to focus on the specific extract of text or dance sequences chosen. Where candidates have done this part successfully, it was easier for them to consider their own intentions in Task 1b, for example, are they planning on a key change or an acoustic version of a song? Have they edited scenes or characters? If so, why? and does this change the original performance intention? Candidates can consider the implications of performing in the context of an audition without set, costume and lighting for example. For Acting and Musical Theatre responses, it is acceptable to combine scenes, cut lines of dialogue or characters etc, update references if appropriate, candidates should then reflect on the changes within their response.

Task 2
Outline a rehearsal schedule that will enable you to be fully prepared for the
performance required in the brief.

This task highlights candidates' understanding of the rehearsal process by asking them to plan a schedule. High level responses included reference to the different rehearsal types and key stages within the process. For example, initial read through / walk through, blocking, individual rehearsals, rehearsals with an accompanist or backing track, technical and dress rehearsals and so forth. Music Technology candidates should be considering the process they will go through and plan a schedule of their time accordingly, for example which parts they would input first, through to editing, pitch, rhythm and velocity and using the software to produce a final mix. There is no need for candidates to produce extensive commentary into the different types of rehearsals, but to achieve the top mark they should be able to show that they have included different types of rehearsals / stages, rather than just a generic 'rehearse' statement. Centres are reminded that these should be individual responses, not a collective group schedule if working with others. There may well be some similarities in relation to when group rehearsals will be scheduled, it is up to the candidates to demonstrate their own understanding for this task.

Task 3
Produce a reflective journal that records the practical rehearsal process required to
ensure you are fully prepared for the performance required in the brief.

In this task, candidates are required to detail the journey from page to performance. In a number of responses, this task had been submitted with individual bullet point sentences which did not highlight knowledge and understanding of how to create a performance.

Candidates need to be able to describe what they did, how they did it (discipline techniques), why (how the performance improved) and plan for the next rehearsal. It was pleasing to see a number of Music Technology responses including screenshots, and some Acting and Musical Theatre responses with annotated scripts with blocking moves or dance notation. Where screenshots or rehearsal photos were used, higher achieving responses included annotations on these which outlined candidates' thought process, demonstrated what they had been working on and how they used discipline related techniques to overcome specific problems. Candidates were more successful when they were able to use discipline specific terminology accurately. Their responses would often be more concise and accurate. Where plans may have changed from the initial ideas and schedule then successful responses made reference to this.

High achieving responses demonstrated candidates' understanding of professional practice throughout the logs, for example, with the use of subject specific vocabulary, how they have explored canon, dynamics, proxemics, articulation, how they have worked on fluency and accuracy. Lower achieving examples would often refer to 'doing blocking', for example, without any discussion about how they had experimented with different ideas, used proxemics and levels to experiment with different ideas before explaining how they had come to the conclusions seen in their final performance. The most successful responses also had relevant health and safety considerations embedded throughout, rather than a generic risk assessment submitted as additional evidence. Examples here included, how a dancer was preparing for a rehearsal, such as making sure they were wearing correct clothing and footwear, removing any jewellery, warming up their bodies. Music Technology candidates considered that they may be sitting for long periods of time or thought about noise levels on headphones. Successful responses were able to use the reflective logs to consider any responses to feedback, and the actions candidates have taken to improve their work in light of this.

Task 4
Perform / present your chosen piece(s) to an audience.

It has been a pleasure to see and hear the range of practical work submitted by candidates. In this series, moderators saw a range of approaches to the task, with some centres using this unit to raise the profile of the Performing Arts in their school and giving a more formal showcase type of environment for an external audience. In a number of cases this was really giving the candidates a taste of professional practice and preparing them well for Unit 3, it was clear that the candidates had thrived when given opportunities such as this, some centres had supported candidates to be really creative with their approach and included things such as QR codes to collect audience feedback, professional looking programme notes which were used as candidate IDs. Although things such as programme notes etc are not required and not explicitly assessed, this was one example of how candidates demonstrated their wider understanding of professional practice. This is obviously very dependent on individual context, and we have seen some equally high quality work performed in the classroom to a much smaller audience. It was also very encouraging to witness opportunities centres had created to support candidates who may have found performing challenging. It was encouraging to see the support and encouragement candidates gave to each other when sharing performances.

Approaches to the unit continue to include a combination of solo and ensemble performances. The majority of the work seen consisted of individual pieces of repertoire, although a number of candidates chose to submit a portfolio made up of different tracks / extracts to make up the time, either approach is acceptable. Centres are reminded of the time requirements of 3 - 6 minutes for this unit. There is no specific penalty applied for work under or over time, however if work is under the required time, then candidates will be unlikely to meet all the requirements of the top band. Music candidates were generally influenced by pop culture in their choice of repertoire. Blood Brothers remains a common choice of text for Acting candidates, although it was encouraging to see some candidates starting to select repertoire across a wider range of styles and time periods. The most common choice of Musical Theatre repertoire seen was 'Heathers', 'Matilda' and 'Everybody's Talking About Jamie'.

The quality of recordings is improving, centres should consider the placement of the recording equipment. If too far from the candidates, then the recording may not capture the subtleties of facial expressions and the intricacy of footwork, or sound quality may be poor. It is acceptable to make use of pan and zoom on the recording equipment if required. The editing of final performances is not permitted.

For clarity, for Music submissions the candidate performs live in front of an audience which is then video recorded, for Music Technology, candidates will have sequenced parts of a performance into a DAW and manipulated it to create a final piece, this can be submitted as an audio recording.

It is essential that in group performances candidates can be identified. The best way to do this is through introductions at the start of the recording or it could be recorded before or after and edited in. Some centres exploited the concept of the brief, with candidates introducing themselves and telling the audition panel what they intended to perform and what roles they performed (especially if multi-rolling). If candidates are performing in an ensemble dance or drama, please ensure that if you are including identification photos with the ORS (which some centres helpfully did), then the candidates' photos are taken on performance day with the same hairstyle and costume that they are wearing in the final performance, rather than their start of year school photograph.

Task 5
Evaluate the success of your performance including what you have learned from undertaking this work and how it will inform your future performances.

Reflecting on a performance and analysing the success in respect of a given brief is an integral part of the creative arts industry. Candidates should be able to reflect on their strengths and areas for future development, to do this they need to receive comprehensive feedback from the audience of their audition / presentation. Successful submissions reflected on feedback and linked this with candidates' self-reflections to determine their strengths and where they needed to further develop their practice. In-depth analysis made use of the elements and devices of the discipline to create a justified evaluation of the success of the performance, responses were mature and perceptive. Less successful submissions were descriptive accounts of what candidates had performed, without commenting on its success against the requirements of the brief or by referring to the success of their performance in relation to their intentions from Task 1b. They often lacked a balance between analysis and in-depth evaluation. As with other tasks, evidence for this task can be presented using a variety of methods, including prose, a vlog or an interview. Prompts are allowed and may support candidates to fulfil the requirements of the task.

Some candidates presented a hybrid portfolio of prose, video evidence and annotated screenshots or photos. It is encouraging to note how centres are adapting their approach to the supporting tasks. More centres are encouraging candidates to create video evidence which is then embedded in PowerPoint presentations, this particularly supports those candidates for whom written tasks are a challenge.

Task marking – Comments on approaches to internal marking

Overall, centres have applied the marking criteria more confidently and accurately. Where centre assessment was generous, it was often in Tasks 1 and 5. For Task 1, to achieve the higher band, candidates need to be able to focus on specific aspects of their chosen extract or piece of dance, or music, commenting on the technical challenge of the piece to achieve the intended theme and mood of the original piece and comment on how they will adapt the original for their specific context in relation to the brief of Unit 1. Responses for Task 5 need to be both analytical and evaluative. In many cases marks had been awarded for responses which repeated feedback candidates had received, rather than fully reflecting on it and considering how they will use the feedback to improve. Centres were most accurate with Task 4.

Administration

Overall, centres were following the subject specific upload guidance and had organised supporting evidence into two zipped folders, one for administration and one for candidate evidence. Where this is followed, it makes the upload process more straightforward. Unclear labelling of tasks makes the moderation process more challenging, as moderators must search for evidence which may be suitable for a task, or in many cases, contact centres for missing evidence, as it has been overlooked when uploading.

It is crucial that all candidates can be clearly identified, many centres did this effectively, with clear candidate introductions recorded, and / or photographs or annotated screenshots of the video evidence. Centres are reminded that if a moderator is unable to clearly identify a candidate, then they will be unable to review the work for that candidate.

Summary of Unit 1 Key Points

- The most successful responses included accurate and appropriate use of discipline specific vocabulary.

- Links to professional working practices should be included throughout.

- Reflective logs should include key actions taken during the rehearsal process, including how candidates explored the devices and concepts of their chosen discipline to develop their final performance, then the impact this had.

PERFORMING ARTS

Level 1 / Level 2

January 2025

Unit 2 Creating

Overview of the Component

Unit 2 is the Creating Unit. Candidates must create original work in response to the published brief.

Unit 2 enables candidates to gain, develop and demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the skills and techniques needed to create and refine original work in the performing arts. This unit can be completed through a performance discipline or a production discipline.

Creatives work in a huge range of different disciplines and environments, sometimes as individuals and sometimes as part of a team. They may work to a brief of their own design or create something to a commissioned brief from someone else, that is why it is imperative that all the work created by the candidates should always be focused on the brief. The brief should be at the core of every task, underpinning every creative decision to allow a sense of journey to a final creative product. The brief should enable all candidates to have a clear vision of what they are creating.

In some instances, candidates had an outcome that was of a good standard, but their logbooks did not always reflect this journey. It is important to remember that candidates should be encouraged to be as creative as they wish in response to the set brief, but they need to be able to demonstrate throughout the process how they have arrived at their final outcome.

Candidates need to be taught how to write a melody, how to create dialogue, how lighting can be used to create particular effects etc. as appropriate to their chosen discipline. This can be achieved through looking at how other practitioners have worked and comparing techniques, as well as by giving candidates short exercises to complete. Developing these skills before starting the controlled assessment supports candidates to ensure that Task 1 is about how their skills will be used to create an outcome.

There was a variety of approaches to this unit from individual composition tasks to ensemble devised drama, it was pleasing to see a range of performance and production disciplines being presented.

Overall, the performance candidates showed their discipline well, but there was still a general lack of skill developed in the production disinclines. The focus needs to be on how the production discipline was used in the creating of the outcome. Production candidates can either design for a group within the centre, or create original designs for a pre existing piece of work which is relevant to the themes within the brief.

Comments on individual questions / sections

Task 1
Outline the components that you considered when writing your creative brief.

Research to support the outcome should be the focus of this task. It should be the foundation of candidates' creating, so that they can hang their idea to something solid. Allow them to use some Blue Sky thinking and be creative.

The piece of work can be in any appropriate format but should start with a statement of what the candidate intends to create, before adding the information required. Where the work was successful, candidates had a good awareness of the intended purpose and effect of their created piece. It was focused on **why** the outcome would be fit for purpose and had clear research to support that understanding.

There was a better understanding this series of what the production candidates intended to do. In Task 1, production candidates should focus on how their skill will be used to create their outcome, sometimes if working in groups, there was a tendency for Task 1 to focus on the actual performance ideas, rather than how the designs would contribute to this. By outlining in Task 1 what discipline specific skills they will need, the Task 2 journey becomes a record of what and how things were created based on the skills outlined here.

There were good connections to the candidates' understanding of the scale of their creative work. All disciplines showed an understanding of the number of performers, or the equipment / instruments needed to produce their outcome for Task 3, but there is still a lack of practitioner research seen in many tasks which links to the final outcome.

Successful responses included focused practitioner research which demonstrated how candidates might apply this to their own ideas and development of work. Some candidates presented lengthy documents outlining biographies of their chosen practitioners. Centres are advised that this depth of background detail is not required, what is important is that candidates are able to demonstrate their understanding of the work / style of the practitioner by considering how this might be relevant to their own work. As ideas change throughout the process, candidates may become less influenced by these practitioners, this is fine and they do not need to redo this part of the task in that case, Task 2 will likely document how and why this has been the case.

Task 2 – To be completed alongside preparing for Task 3
Produce a development log that records the exploration and development of your idea in response to a creative brief.

The evidence was presented in a variety of ways. Some centres opted for a word document with many others using PowerPoint. Where candidates included videos of the process this supported their demonstration of how the work was being developed. Many centres embedded the videos or soundtracks into PowerPoint, this aided moderation and enabled candidates to respond to the work in the same place.

There was evidence of clear feedback and how this influenced the work created by the candidates. Where the work was most successful, candidates had a real sense of ownership and a clear understanding of the brief. The brief and candidates' ideas based on it framed every decision – and these were a pleasure to read. The log should contain evidence which shows how the candidates have explored the relevant ideas and techniques as appropriate to the piece they are creating. High level responses considered problems encountered and what the candidates had explored in order to overcome these, they then reflected on whether this was successful.

High level responses included clear reference to subject specific vocabulary and candidates were able to demonstrate their understanding. There is no set number of logs required for this task, but candidates do need to be able to demonstrate the development throughout the whole process, so one or two responses is unlikely to meet all of the requirements in the highest level of the mark bands. Centres are reminded that the milestone recordings submitted support this task, not replace it.

Where candidates have worked in groups it is crucial in this task that they make clear references to what they have contributed, this is their opportunity to demonstrate what they understand and their ideas, even if they end up not being used in the final outcome.

Task 3
Present your final piece(s) to an audience.

This is where the actual created piece is assessed. There are various discipline specific criteria laid out in the marking scheme.

For assessment purposes Task 3 is identified as being just the presentation of the completed piece (or pieces) of work, but of course this is the culmination of the work done in actually creating the piece of work they will present.

It is best practice where possible that the candidate has the opportunity to share what they have created with an audience, and for that audience to give constructive feedback. There is no requirement for the actual feedback to be filmed.

The assessment here is not focused on whether the candidate has managed to perform or present their piece perfectly, although this will aid in communicating the nuances of each discipline, it's whether the creative skills or methods employed *in the creation* and are evidenced in the presentation. Many candidates introduced themselves at the start of their presentations explaining why and how they had created their piece.

Production candidates should be presenting their ideas and outcome if produced. Centres are reminded that production candidates can either design for a group within the centre (if appropriate) or create new designs for an existing piece of work which meets the requirements of the set brief. Where candidates have designed for a group and this has been realised in performance, then including the recording of performers wearing the costume etc. is useful.

It is very important that all candidates can be identified. This is their chance to shine and share their outcome so clear identification is vital.

Task 4
Evaluate the success of your creative process and final creation. Discuss the areas of your work that need improving / developing and explain how you would make the improvements or justify why particular feedback has not been acted upon.

This task can be a written piece of work, or in any other format which is appropriate to the candidate. Many candidates did well in this task explaining how the feedback given during the whole process helped them. Successful responses commented on how effective or not feedback had been and how they developed their work accordingly. It can be difficult to write about how you could improve something which was successful, so candidates need to be aspirational and consider what they could do if they had much bigger / better resources available, professional actors / dancers / musicians as performers, a fully equipped theatre with the best lighting / sound rig and a team of technicians, much more time etc.

Many gave good examples of how successfully the outcome met the brief – but where this was not clear candidates struggled to evaluate effectively. Production candidates did not always focus on their skill enough. They need to demonstrate how their skill had developed during the process. It may be helpful to refer to the discipline specific lists of points which appear at the top of the criteria for Tasks 2 and 3.

The most successful candidates were reflective and could see why their work was suitable or not. They showed this through their understating of their skill. This part of the evaluation process was a success for the highest achieving candidates.

This does not need to be written as an essay. Candidates can add images or screenshots to support their knowledge and help them explain their point. Overall, the evaluation task did give evidence of what was being created, but there is a need for candidates to focus on how their skills helped them be creative.

Task marking – Comments on approaches to internal marking

Overall, centres have applied the marking criteria more confidently and accurately. Where centre assessment was generous, it was often in Tasks 1 and 4. For Task 1, to achieve the higher band, candidates need to be able to focus on specific aspects of their chosen practitioners and explain how this has influenced their creating work. Responses for Task 4 need to be both analytical and evaluative. In many cases marks had been awarded for responses which repeated feedback candidates had received, rather than fully reflecting on it and considering how they will use the feedback to improve. Centres were most accurate with Task 3.

Administration

Overall, centres were following the subject specific upload guidance and had organised supporting evidence into two zipped folders, one for administration and one for candidate evidence. Where this is followed, it makes the upload process more straightforward. Unclear labelling of tasks makes the moderation process more challenging, as moderators must search for evidence which may be suitable for a task, or in many cases, contact centres for missing evidence, as it has been overlooked when uploading.

It is crucial that all candidates can be clearly identified, many centres did this effectively, with clear candidate introductions recorded, and / or photographs or annotated screenshots of the video evidence. Centres are reminded that if a moderator is unable to clearly identify a candidate, then they will be unable to review the work for that candidate.

Unit 2 Summary of Key Points

Key points for centres to consider for future series:

- Centres are reminded that the Unit 2 brief changes each September, they must be making sure that the correct brief is used (see front cover of brief).

- Candidates must be able to evidence how their ideas have developed in response to the brief.

- Research is the key to Tasks 1 and 2. It will allow candidates to focus on why their outcome is suitable for the brief and their target audience.

- More reference is needed to professional practice – and again this will allow candidates to focus on their skill and the brief.

Supporting you

Useful contacts and links

Our friendly subject team is on hand to support you between 8.30am and 5.00pm, Monday to Friday.
Tel: 029 2026 5470
Email: performingarts@wjec.co.uk / performingarts@eduqas.co.uk
Qualification webpage: Level 1/2 Vocational Award in Performing Arts / Level 1/2 Vocational award in Performing Arts

See other useful contacts here: Useful Contacts | WJEC / Useful Contacts | Eduqas

CPD Training / Professional Learning

Access our popular, free online CPD/PL courses to receive exam feedback and put questions to our subject team, and attend one of our face-to-face events, focused on enhancing teaching and learning, providing practical classroom ideas and developing understanding of marking and assessment.

Please find details for all our courses here: https://www.wjec.co.uk/home/professional-learning/ / https://www.eduqas.co.uk/home/professional-learning/

WJEC Qualifications

As Wales' largest awarding body, WJEC supports its education community by providing trusted bilingual qualifications, specialist support, and reliable assessment to schools and colleges across the country. This allows our learners to reach their full potential.

With more than 70 years' experience, we are also amongst the leading providers in both England and Northern Ireland.