

2016 HSC Drama Marking Guidelines

Section I — Australian Drama and Theatre (Core Study)

Question 1

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides an insightful discussion of the provided statement with reference to at least TWO plays in this topic Provides insightful and relevant supporting evidence* Provides an insightful and comprehensive response to the question in a convincing, coherent manner, which may demonstrate flair 	17–20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a substantial discussion of the provided statement with reference to at least TWO plays in this topic Provides relevant supporting evidence* Provides a substantial response to the question in a coherent manner 	13–16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a general discussion of the provided statement with reference to at least TWO plays in this topic Provides some relevant supporting evidence* Provides an adequate response to some of the issues in the question 	9–12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a basic discussion of the provided statement with some reference to the plays in this topic Provides a basic response with little relevant supporting evidence* 	5–8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides some discussion of the provided statement with limited reference to the plays in this topic Provides a limited response with little or no relevant supporting evidence* 	1–4

* Supporting evidence may include examples, quotations, evidence from the chosen texts, real or imagined productions and/or practical experiences related to the selected topic area

Section II — Studies in Drama and Theatre

Question 2 — Tragedy

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explains insightfully how political and/or social forces heighten the audience's experience of the characters' suffering in TWO plays set for study Provides insightful and relevant supporting evidence* Provides an insightful and comprehensive response to the question in a convincing, coherent manner, which may demonstrate flair 	17–20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explains substantially how political and/or social forces heighten the audience's experience of the characters' suffering in TWO plays set for study Provides relevant supporting evidence* Provides a substantial response to the question in a coherent manner 	13–16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explains broadly how political and/or social forces heighten the audience's experience of the characters' suffering in TWO plays set for study Provides some relevant supporting evidence* Provides an adequate response to some of the issues in the question 	9–12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outlines some discussion of how political and/or social forces affect the audience's experience of the characters' suffering in the plays set for study Provides a basic response with little relevant supporting evidence* 	5–8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments on some ideas that may relate to some aspect of the content of the question Provides a limited response with little or no relevant supporting evidence* 	1–4

* Supporting evidence may include examples, quotations, evidence from the chosen text, real or imagined productions and/or practical experiences related to the selected topic area

Question 3 — Approaches to Acting

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explains insightfully how TWO practitioners' philosophies are evident in their process and in performance • Provides insightful and relevant supporting evidence* • Provides an insightful and comprehensive response to the question in a convincing, coherent manner, which may demonstrate flair 	17–20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explains substantially how TWO practitioners' philosophies are evident in their process and in performance • Provides relevant supporting evidence* • Provides a substantial response to the question in a coherent manner 	13–16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explains broadly how TWO practitioners' philosophies are evident in their process and in performance • Provides some relevant supporting evidence* • Provides an adequate response to some of the issues in the question 	9–12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outlines some of the ways the practitioners' philosophies are evident in their process and/or in performance • Provides a basic response with little relevant supporting evidence* 	5–8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments on some ideas that may relate to some aspect of the content of the question • Provides a limited response with little or no relevant supporting evidence* 	1–4

* Supporting evidence may include examples, quotations, evidence from the chosen text, real or imagined productions and/or practical experiences related to the selected topic area

Question 4 — Verbatim Theatre in Australia

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explains insightfully how community involvement limits and enriches the process of creating verbatim theatre with reference to TWO plays set for study and their experience of the topic • Provides insightful and relevant supporting evidence* • Provides an insightful and comprehensive response to the question in a convincing, coherent manner, which may demonstrate flair 	17–20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explains substantially how community involvement limits and enriches the process of creating verbatim theatre with reference to TWO plays set for study and their experience of the topic • Provides relevant supporting evidence* • Provides a substantial response to the question in a coherent manner 	13–16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explains broadly how community involvement limits and enriches the process of creating verbatim theatre with reference to TWO plays set for study and their experience of the topic • Provides some relevant supporting evidence* • Provides an adequate response to some of the issues in the question 	9–12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outlines some aspects of community involvement in creating verbatim theatre with some reference to the plays set for study and/or their experience of the topic • Provides a basic response with little relevant supporting evidence* 	5–8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments on some ideas that may relate to some aspect of the content of the question • Provides a limited response with little or no relevant supporting evidence* 	1–4

* Supporting evidence may include examples, quotations, evidence from the chosen text, real or imagined productions and/or practical experiences related to the selected topic area

Question 5 — Black Comedy

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides an insightful discussion of the quotation in reference to TWO plays set for study Provides insightful and relevant supporting evidence* Provides an insightful and comprehensive response to the question in a convincing, coherent manner, which may demonstrate flair 	17–20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a substantial discussion of the quotation in reference to TWO plays set for study Provides relevant supporting evidence* Provides a substantial response to the question in a coherent manner 	13–16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a general discussion of the quotation in reference to TWO plays set for study Provides some relevant supporting evidence* Provides an adequate response to some of the issues in the question 	9–12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a basic discussion of the quotation with some reference to the plays set for study Provides a basic response with little relevant supporting evidence* 	5–8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments on some ideas that may relate to some aspect of the content of the question Provides a limited response with little or no relevant supporting evidence* 	1–4

* Supporting evidence may include examples, quotations, evidence from the chosen text, real or imagined productions and/or practical experiences related to the selected topic area

Question 6 — Multi-Discipline Theatre

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explains insightfully how technology generates and expresses ideas in multi-discipline theatre with reference to their study and experience of the topic • Provides insightful and relevant supporting evidence* • Provides an insightful and comprehensive response to the question in a convincing, coherent manner, which may demonstrate flair 	17–20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explains substantially how technology generates and expresses ideas in multi-discipline theatre with reference to their study and experience of the topic • Provides relevant supporting evidence* • Provides a substantial response to the question in a coherent manner 	13–16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explains broadly how technology generates and expresses ideas in multi-discipline theatre with reference to their study and experience of the topic • Provides some relevant supporting evidence* • Provides an adequate response to some of the issues in the question 	9–12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outlines some discussion of technology and/or ideas in multi-discipline theatre with some reference to their study and/or experience of the topic • Provides a basic response with little relevant supporting evidence* 	5–8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments on some ideas that may relate to some aspect of the content of the question • Provides a limited response with little or no relevant supporting evidence* 	1–4

* Supporting evidence may include examples, quotations, evidence from the chosen text, real or imagined productions and/or practical experiences related to the selected topic area

Question 7 — Significant Plays of the 20th Century

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explains insightfully how TWO plays set for study manipulated theatrical structures and forms to present ideas in new ways Provides insightful and relevant supporting evidence* Provides an insightful and comprehensive response to the question in a convincing, coherent manner, which may demonstrate flair 	17–20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explains substantially how TWO plays set for study manipulated theatrical structures and forms to present ideas in new ways Provides relevant supporting evidence* Provides a substantial response to the question in a coherent manner 	13–16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explains broadly how TWO plays set for study manipulated theatrical structures and forms to present ideas in new ways Provides some relevant supporting evidence* Provides an adequate response to some of the issues in the question 	9–12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outlines some of the ways TWO plays set for study manipulated theatrical structures and/or forms to present ideas Provides a basic response with little relevant supporting evidence* 	5–8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments on some ideas that may relate to some aspect of the content of the question Provides a limited response with little or no relevant supporting evidence* 	1–4

* Supporting evidence may include examples, quotations, evidence from the chosen text, real or imagined productions and/or practical experiences related to the selected topic area

* Theatrical structures and forms may include consideration of a broad range of theatrical techniques.

Question 8 — Japanese Traditional and Contemporary Theatre

Criteria	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluates insightfully the extent to which Suzuki’s approach to acting is informed by the traditional Japanese theatre aesthetic with reference to their study and experience of the topic • Provides insightful and relevant supporting evidence* • Provides an insightful and comprehensive response to the question in a convincing, coherent manner, which may demonstrate flair 	17–20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluates substantially the extent to which Suzuki’s approach to acting is informed by the traditional Japanese theatre aesthetic with reference to their study and experience of the topic • Provides relevant supporting evidence* • Provides a substantial response to the question in a coherent manner 	13–16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluates broadly the extent to which Suzuki’s approach to acting is informed by the traditional Japanese theatre aesthetic with reference to their study and experience of the topic • Provides some relevant supporting evidence* • Provides an adequate response to some of the issues in the question 	9–12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outlines the ways Suzuki’s approach to acting is informed by traditional Japanese theatre with some reference to their study and/or experience of the topic • Provides a basic response with little relevant supporting evidence* 	5–8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments on some ideas that may relate to some aspect of the content of the question • Provides a limited response with little or no relevant supporting evidence* 	1–4

* Supporting evidence may include examples, quotations, evidence from the chosen text, real or imagined productions and/or practical experiences related to the selected topic area

2016 HSC Drama Mapping Grid

Section I — Australian Drama and Theatre (Core Study)

Question	Marks	Content	Syllabus outcomes
1	20	Australian Drama and Theatre (Core Study) – Dramatic Traditions in Australia OR Contemporary Australian Theatre Practice	H3.1, H3.2, H3.3

Section II — Studies in Drama and Theatre

Question	Marks	Content	Syllabus outcomes
2	20	Studies in Drama and Theatre – Tragedy	H3.1, H3.2, H3.3
3	20	Studies in Drama and Theatre – Approaches to Acting	H3.1, H3.2, H3.3
4	20	Studies in Drama and Theatre – Verbatim Theatre	H3.1, H3.2, H3.3
5	20	Studies in Drama and Theatre – Black Comedy	H3.1, H3.2, H3.3
6	20	Studies in Drama and Theatre – Multi-Discipline Theatre	H3.1, H3.2, H3.3
7	20	Studies in Drama and Theatre – Significant Plays of the 20th Century	H3.1, H3.2, H3.3
8	20	Studies in Drama and Theatre – Japanese Traditional and Contemporary Theatre	H3.1, H3.2, H3.3