

GCSE

Edexcel GCSE

Drama (1699)

This Examiners' Report relates to Mark  
Scheme Publication code: UA017693

Summer 2006

Examiners' Report

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information please call our Customer Services on 0870 240 9800, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.org.uk](http://www.edexcel.org.uk).

Summer 2006

Publications Code UA017693

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2006

## Contents

1.	Paper 1 Examiners' Report	5
2.	Paper 2 Examiners' Report	11
3.	Statistics	19

Edexcel Ltd holds the copyright for this publication. Further copies of the **Mark Schemes** may be obtained from Edexcel Publication.



## Paper One - Drama Coursework

### Performance of Candidates in this Part of the Examination

Much of the work this year was excellent. Many candidates had clearly benefited from exciting courses that ensured progression from KS3 into KS4 through the specification programme of study.

It was also evident that many centres are making use of outside agencies to widen their candidates' experience - school experience placements, residencies, local theatre companies, touring TIE, arts centres and local events.

However, excellent Drama practice for the course as a whole did not always meet Paper 1 requirements or enable the candidates to meet the assessment objectives. For example, exploration of a theme or text may lead to a performance during the course but is inappropriate when the candidates are being assessed for this paper. There was also a marked increase in the use of published schemes: while these are appropriate as part of the course it was felt that they do not always meet the requirements or provide sufficient challenge for candidates to achieve expected levels.

### UNIT 1: Drama Exploration I

#### Exploration of a Theme, Idea or Issue

War remains the most popular theme for this unit although the chosen texts/stimuli and focus was more varied. Conflict, prejudice and protest were also popular subjects. Themes such as Equal Rights were treated with varying success. There has also been a perceptible increase in the theme of mental health over the past three years, although some moderators felt this was not always as carefully handled as it might have been.

Centres who planned for the texts to act as stimulus for the exploration of the chosen theme enabled their candidates to explore it in more depth, sometimes bringing the exploration full circle to re examine the texts in the final session. It was noted that many centres confined the work to the interpretation of a new text in each session which gave the candidates limited scope to meet AO2 Development in sufficient depth. For example, a scheme on Equal Rights which used a variety of texts for interpretation and avoided any exploration of the issue itself through drama.

There was some excellent work where candidates used drama to make connections between the contexts of the theme explored and the world around them as part of the Evaluation phase.

It was felt that different types of stimulus/text used sparingly led to more inventive drama. For example a statue and a poem, a recorded interview and a photograph. The more immediately drama was used to respond, the more the candidates were able to explore the chosen theme in depth.

## UNIT 2: Drama Exploration II

### Exploration of a Complete and Substantial Playtext

'Blood Brothers' is still the most popular text but other old favourites such as 'The Crucible', 'Find Me', plays by Godber, Wheeler, Churchill and Russell were also popular. 'A Taste of Honey' and 'One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest' were used by more centres this year.

Centres who were able to select a text that was accessible to all their candidates and provided sufficient challenge met the requirements most successfully. For example, a special needs school chose 'Blood Brothers' while a selective school worked on 'King Lear'.

Centres who ensured that their candidates had access to the text or saw a production before or during the assessment were able to meet the aims of the unit more successfully. A significant number of centres explored related themes before beginning the assessment to enable the candidates to work directly from the text and develop their ideas through on and off text activities.

There was an increased focus on set and costume in the Development phase which worked well when it arose directly from the practical work and was not a hypothetical task for the portfolio.

It was evident that candidates who had experience of working with playtexts as part of the course approached this unit with more confidence and understanding. Playtexts such as shortened versions of Shakespeare's plays and collections of short plays such as Grimm's 'Fairy Tales' and Ayckbourn's 'Confusions' did not meet the specification requirements for a 'complete and substantial playtext'. Some centres looked at a combination of two texts for example 'Blood Brothers' and 'Romeo and Juliet' which also disadvantaged their candidates. Centres which focused chiefly on the play's context or related themes did not meet the specification requirements for this unit.

Candidates who had been able to see a range of live theatre were advantaged - and it was evident that some were able to see more than others. It was more difficult for those centres where candidates had not been able to see an outside performance at all although a number did make use of the school production, another GCSE group's performances or AS and A2 examination pieces most successfully.

Most candidates had been able to see at least one live theatre performance as part of the course. These varied from pantomime, professional and amateur productions, TIE, touring, subsidised and mainstream theatre, musicals, Shakespeare and the Connections series at the NT. A few centres had been able to enjoy a workshop session with the company whose production they had seen or were about to see.

## Records Of Work

There were many different methods of presentation. Many centres now indicate where assessment objectives were met, how the drama strategies, medium and elements were included and often give details of how portfolio tasks arose from the work.

Most centres provided a strong contrast between the work for Unit 1 and Unit 2, meeting specification requirements and ensuring that their candidates had both breadth and depth of experience across the paper as a whole.

A significant number of centres had planned work to meet the abilities of the candidates and provide challenges to encourage further achievement. For example, an excellent exploration of the theme of prejudice for a wide range of abilities ensured all candidates met the assessment objectives through differentiated activities, varied questioning and portfolio tasks.

A balance between tightly structured sessions with opportunities for analysis, reflection and flexibility enabled teachers to adapt to candidates' responses more successfully. Where the Record of Work had been annotated to show this, moderators felt confident of the balance of teaching and assessment at the centre.

Close observation of the specification requirements helped centres to ensure that their candidates earned marks by meeting the assessment objectives. Centres where teachers used questioning as a means of focusing and guiding enabled their candidates to think more deeply and analytically about the work.

Once again, there were fewer candidates in Bands 4 and 5 although it was clear from the evidence that those earning fewer marks benefited from appropriately differentiated activities.

Interpretations of Response and Development varied. Some centres consider the first three hours to be Response and the next three to be Development and mark accordingly, assessing candidates for Evaluation as appropriate within each session. Others include Response, Development and Evaluation in each session. Either way, it was significant that most centres saw Development as an opportunity to explore the issue or play text in further depth combining aspects of the chosen texts with ideas arising from the Response phase. Most changes to schemes of work were seen at this stage.

It was noted that many centres include portfolio task-setting in their schemes. Some moderators have been concerned that the practical drama was affected by the pressure to complete written work e.g. making notes during a session instead of discussing and sharing ideas.

An increasing number of centres used the minimum requirement for strategies, elements and medium and did not provide sufficiently challenging texts or structures, which severely limited their candidates' opportunities to meet the assessment objectives.

## **Recordings and Video/DVD Outline: D1b**

Most centres had access to appropriate equipment and were able to record most if not all of the practical sessions, sending only the two sessions that showed the range of ability most clearly.

A balance between teacher-led work with sufficient flexibility to respond to candidates' ideas was seen on most recordings. Complete sessions placed the work in context especially if the candidates were accustomed to the presence of the camera. Where there was a variety of tasks the standard could be seen more clearly. Those centres that placed the camera close to or within the circle of chairs during evaluations ensured that the quality of their candidates' discussion could be heard.

Those centres that aimed for depth of experience, for example analysing and exploring a situation through different strategies and groupings, demonstrated their candidates' ability to use drama to explore and develop ideas most fully.

A few centres submitted edited recordings of staged discussions and rehearsed improvisations which did not enable the moderator to see the candidates meeting the assessment objectives.

Centres who completed the D1b Video/DVD Outline providing details of timing, teaching strategies and indicated which Assessment Objectives were being met ensured that moderators could make informed judgments about the centre standard as indicated on the D1c.

It was helpful when the centre indicated which sessions had been recorded.

It was noted that some centres interpreted Evaluation as a description of the use of strategies, elements and medium used in the practical work rather than an analytical discussion.

## **Centre Details: D1c**

This was the most successfully completed of all the forms, providing valuable information. Most centres gave full details of their standardisation process. It was noted that a number of new teachers were supported by senior colleagues or ASTs.

## **Teacher-Examiner Comments: D1a**

Centres that referred to candidates' practical work best supported the marks that had been awarded. This was particularly relevant when little or no portfolio evidence was submitted. Comments that linked practical work with portfolio evidence were also useful especially when a candidate had achieved higher marks for one part of the paper than another. Most centres indicated where a candidate had not completed the whole or part of a unit and reflected this in their marking.

It was evident that most centres had taken this part of the administration seriously, ensuring that comments were relevant and work carefully differentiated.



Unfortunately, many centres found entering the marks correctly and completing the addition more of a challenge.

## Portfolios

A balance of essay, creative writing, diagrams, illustrations and photographs was used by the majority of centres.

It appeared that many candidates selected the approach which was appropriate for their purposes.

Some centres created writing frames; the most successful used them as a starting point so that candidates were not restricted by their teacher's ideas of what should be written.

A significant number of candidates wrote far too much. Although this reflected their enthusiasm and interest it is inappropriate for so much time to be spent on the portfolio. Increasingly, centres are able to help candidates focus upon recording and reflecting in depth upon key moments rather than writing about everything in each session.

Creative writing was used in both Response and Development. Where this was fully annotated or complemented with details of the practical work from which it had arisen, the assessment tasks were met.

It was felt that centres who used questioning as a deliberate teaching strategy enabled their candidates to discuss their practical work more fully on paper. There was often a clear connection between the practical work seen on the recording and the candidates' own experience of the session in their portfolio.

Evaluation in Unit 1 focused on more significant moments for the candidates, clearly providing their teachers with valuable insight into their depth of understanding and achievements.

Most candidates wrote about the live performances they had seen in Unit 2 with the fluent use of drama terminology, demonstrating a sophisticated understanding of the process of exploring a text and how it was communicated in performance. This was often the most fluent and fully addressed task in the portfolios.

More candidates had organised their writing for each unit into three parts: Response, Development and Evaluation and used a variety of A4 and A3 paper to record and reflect upon their work.

Unfortunately, some centres used A2 paper, card or sugar paper and allowed candidates to include downloaded information and background details.

## **Deadlines**

Most centres met the deadline for Paper One by sending their work in good time so that there was time to address any issues before the end of May. Those centres that responded to contact from the moderator at once were able to replace damaged recordings or supply missing evidence in good time.

A significant number of centres submitted the work late, were difficult to contact and supplied incomplete evidence. No extensions were given. Centres are expected to observe the deadlines for coursework as strictly as dates for written papers.

## **International Centres**

There was much excellent and interesting work. Where centres linked the choice of issue or playtext to the candidates' different cultures as well as the school's context. For example, *Childhood*, *Separation in Families: Find Me and Their Country's Good*. The work was inventive and enabled the candidates to use drama in depth.

The style and quality of drama practice was widely varied although much was focused upon interpreting text rather than exploration and often led to a performance.

There was also a focus upon aspects of staging, design, light and sound. Where this was studio based and enabled the candidates to experiment as part of exploration it was inventive and met the assessment objectives.

## **Conclusion**

The majority of centres ensured that the work met the specification requirements and enabled their candidates to be marked against the three Assessment Objectives. Much exciting and innovative work had taken place and the samples submitted were a real pleasure to moderate. However, despite the excellent quality of drama practice in general it was noted by all moderators that candidates are increasingly being marked over generously.

Centres where there had been a change of teacher or no teacher at all had significant difficulties in producing the required evidence. Centres that did manage to complete the course and both papers successfully in spite of these obstacles are to be commended.

A significant number of centres did not meet the specification requirements either because evidence such as the video/DVD was missing or the work itself was inappropriate. Most of these problems would not have occurred if the specification and the Instructions for the Conduct of the Examination (ICE) document had been read and observed.

## Paper 2 - Drama Performance

### Introduction

This is an externally examined paper but the assessment objectives and criteria do not change from those printed in the specification. In preparing candidates for this unit the specification must be read with close reference to the Instructions for the Conduct of the Examination (ICE) booklet for the current examination series. Each centre chooses the options taken by candidates, the texts or content for devised work and the audience. This paper has elements of both an examined and coursework paper.

Overall, the examining team reported that the standards of previous series had been maintained. In most centres there is a high level of understanding of the requirements of this paper and the majority of candidates are well prepared to both achieve in the examination and enjoy the experience of live performance.

Some examiners felt that there was an increase in candidates being poorly prepared for this paper and producing work that did not meet GCSE standard. However, as in previous series there were many candidates who produced work that not only met the requirements of the paper but exceeded top GCSE standard. These candidates were awarded full marks and often examiners noted that in fact they were '40 plus'.

Again this year there were a number of both new centres and teachers preparing candidates for the first time for this part of the examination. It was commented upon that many of these centres produced work that showed good understanding of the requirements of this paper.

There is still concern regarding the number of non-specialist or supply staff working with candidates on Paper 2. These candidates were often somewhat disadvantaged by the situation as previous work in the GCSE course could not be built upon for the final performance. Centres are reminded that visiting examiners cannot give advice or comment on the work seen before, during or after the visit.

### Requirements

There remain some issues of concern reported by the examining team and it must be stated that most of these have been reported on in previous examiner's reports. Centres must ensure that they put in place the requirements for this paper as detailed in the ICE. The ICE is revised each year in light of both examiner's and teacher's suggestions to ensure that the administration of the paper is clear to all centres. It also includes all the documentation needed for this paper. Centres can download copies of the ICE and the specification from the Edexcel website.

There was again concern that centres do not understand the need for this paper to have examination conditions to support the candidates and ensure security of the examination. These are clearly stated in the ICE document. Disruption by the audience and extraneous noise were of particular concern.

There were changes made to the documentation for this paper this year. However, many examiners report that out of date paperwork was used by some centres. Both

examiners and centres reported that the changes for 2006 clarified the requirements of the paper and were well received.

### **Timing of the Examination**

This year those centres that had made entries in 2005 were allocated an examiner in January/February and most contacted the centres as quickly as possible. Many examiners report that some centres did not contact them for some time despite several repeat phone calls or emails. This often led to the first choice of dates or times for the centre not being possible. Centres need to have some flexibility in arranging the examination date and time. Although Edexcel appreciates that due to both time and space constraints centres put examination dates in their year calendar it is a requirement that the final agreed is negotiated with the examiner.

There was an increase in centres choosing to have twilight or evening sessions again this year. This often seemed to have 2 major advantages. The examination as a performance had a greater sense of occasion and appropriate audiences could attend. Also examination conditions, particularly regarding external noise and giving examiners a private place to consider their marks between performances, were easier to put in place.

Again this year many Paper 2 exams took place in mid to late May. This at times caused concerns as candidates could be involved in other exams or were on study leave. Examiners felt that some candidates had not had a final concentrated rehearsal time immediately before the examination.

There were very few centres whose allocated examiner was not able to attend at the last minute due to personal circumstances. This paper is fortunate in having an excellent regional team structure and Edexcel Allocations Co-ordinator and in most cases a replacement examiner was found. In one case, with a replacement examiner leaving for the centre within minutes of the phone call from the centre to Edexcel. Many thanks to those centres for whom an examiner could not be found for all or part of the examination for their professional response in submitting extra information to support the recorded work.

### **Administration**

The overwhelming concern from examiners this year was the poor administration by too many centres throughout the process. A great deal of the required paperwork was incomplete, inaccurate, late or non-existent until the examiner's arrival in the centre. Examiners wish to come well prepared for the examination and cannot do so without this vital information. Examiners are instructed to arrive 30 minutes prior to the first performance/presentation so any changes can be considered during that time.

There was also concern that the time management of the examination by the centres was poor at times. Examiners expect to examine at least 20 candidates in a 3-hour session. The sessions (morning /afternoon/twilight/evening) must run concurrently. Some examiners arrived at the centre at the agreed time and were waiting for a considerable amount of time before meeting the candidates. Many examiners report arriving promptly for a morning session to be told candidates were not present or ready and the examination was not starting until after 10am.

This was also true of twilight and evening sessions. At times this resulted in candidates performing after 10pm. Some centres with fewer than 20 candidates wanted the examination to take place over one or more days or wanted a time that was spread over 2 sessions for example a 10.30am start and 2.30pm finish.

Centres wishing to have a time period or day outside the regulations of this examination may be required to record the work for external assessment.

There was also concern that some examiners were given very little time to consider their marking between performances and a private place to mark was not provided.

It would be unfair to give the impression that this lack of thought applied to the majority of centres. Most completed all administration very well and the examination was run with professionalism throughout.

Again this year thanks must be given to the centres that had an accompanied visit from members of the senior team. This is an important part of the ongoing monitoring of examiners for the practical performance paper. At all times this extra requirement was dealt with by centres with understanding.

### **The Importance of the Recording of the Performances/Presentations**

It is felt that some centres do not understand the importance of the very best possible recording being made of all performances and presentations. In order to maintain the standards of the examination and ensure that examiners' work is monitored throughout the process a great deal of centres' work is viewed by the senior team alongside examiner notes. Centres should be aware that the senior team may check a centre's work and if examiners have any concerns they must seek another opinion.

Unfortunately, this year it was felt that the quality of the recorded work was less good than in previous series. Too often the camera was not placed close to the examiner and was frequently so far back from the performance that the candidates could not be identified. Another common mistake was examiner and audience heads taking up most of the frame. If there is a large performance space and scenes are performed in different areas the camera may pan to record the work. If the person operating the camera knows the piece some judicious use of close ups can be useful in capturing individual performances.

Performance Support candidate presentations must be made to the camera and the examiner will sit next to the camera. Some examiners felt that candidates expected them to ask them questions as they looked at the documentation. Examiners will look at this evidence after the presentation.

Centres **must** keep a copy of the recorded examination work. Centres are reminded that the recording sent to Edexcel via the examiner is the basis of any Enquiries About Results procedures.

Most centres completed the Video/DVD time sheet well. This is important for finding performances or presentations when looking for specific groups or individual candidate's work. It is also important that centres comment on the quality of the recording. Many centres realise that the recording did not capture

the performance well or had incomplete recordings and add relevant comments to the form. Some centres did not complete this form at all and often it was evident they had not checked the recording.

This year centres were permitted to submit work on DVD. Examiners and centres welcomed this but there were considerable problems. In future, centres must ensure that the DVD can be played on a standard domestic player. Examiners are not required to use a computer to view the work. Also, each presentation/performance must be given a chapter.

The main problem was that many centres failed to send the recording to the visiting examiner within seven working days. Examiners spent much time contacting centres trying to get the recording and many were never sent at all. All written documentation had to be sent to Edexcel with no recordings and no Enquiries About Results will be possible.

### **Identification of the Candidates on the Recordings**

Centres must ensure that all candidates introduce themselves immediately before their performance /presentation, as it will appear on the recording. This can be pre-recorded and edited in to the recording by the centre.

Design candidates must state clearly and slowly the centre name and number followed by their name, candidate number, chosen skill, the performance title and group number. It can be helpful if they have the centre name and number and their name and candidate number written clearly on paper and held up to camera.

Performance candidates must line up in their performance group. It can be helpful if this is done in order of appearance. The first candidate must state clearly and slowly the centre name and number, the date of the performance followed by the performance title and group number.

All candidates must then state clearly and slowly their name and candidate number, role(s) played and give verbal description of all costumes worn in the performance. It is helpful, if there are costume changes, that any costumes worn later are shown to the camera. It can be helpful if the performance candidate's name and candidate number and role(s) played are written clearly on paper and held up to the camera.

The camera must then record the whole group in long shot. It can be helpful if they repeat their name and roles played. The group shot must be held for enough time for someone watching the recording to clearly identify them all. This is the equivalent completing the front sheet of a written paper.

Centres are strongly encouraged to provide the visiting examiner with a group colour photograph for each performance on arrival prior to the examination.

On the examiner candidate mark sheets candidates should give detailed written descriptions of how they will appear in the performance, both physical appearance and costume. Small head and shoulder shots must not be attached to the form as they have proved to be of limited use in aiding identification and can be time consuming for centres to provide.

## Devised Performance

As in all previous series, this is the option taken by the majority of candidates. Work was seen by examiners that covered the full mark range. A few candidates did attend the performance but did so little that no marks could be awarded. There were many candidates whose work exceeded GCSE standard.

Examiners comment on a very high level of understanding by centres of the criteria for this option and it was clear that a well-structured preparation and rehearsal period had taken place. In many centres examiners noted a 'house style' that could support the candidates' approach and final performance. However, there was concern that this was sometimes seen to support less confident candidates and could be limiting for the more able.

One very positive development this year was the detail provided for the Outline Description of the Performance. Many centres had produced a pro forma for this that matched their style of performance. Some produced complete or outline scripts. Examiners welcomed this as it enabled them to be well prepared for the wide range of performance styles and subject matter chosen by candidates.

The content of devised performances was diverse as always. The most effective work was when candidates had something they really wanted to communicate to their audience and had done research into their material. It was noticeable that many referred to work completed in Paper 1 or earlier in the Programme of Study. The challenges of contemporary teenage life remain a popular topic as do the events and aftermath of 9/11 and 7/7. Issues such as race, class, gender and conflict were tackled with a wide range of approaches.

More successful work used a range of strategies for example monologue, freeze frame, flashback, abstract movement or physical theatre. Much of this work was felt to be innovative, challenging and thought provoking theatre as well as a GCSE examination.

Less effective work had a more naturalistic approach and linear narrative structure. It was felt that often this work was highly influenced by current popular television or films and was often a poor copy or parody lacking a sense of candidate ownership or creativity.

Overall, the great majority of centres had ensured that group size and performance length requirements were met. Most groups were between 4 and 6 candidates producing a performance of around 20 minutes. There were fewer overlong performances. Very short performances are self-penalising as candidates have insufficient time to meet all of the criteria. There was some concern that for some tight ensemble pieces using much group movement and vocal work it was a challenge for examiners to identify and mark each individual candidate.

## Scripted Performance

There was a noticeable increase in candidates choosing this option. There was an increase in candidates not understanding the demands of this option and being under prepared, in some cases sitting and attempting to read an extract from a play. However, examiners comment that work was seen that exceeded performances seen for AS Unit 2 performance.

As in previous series John Godber, Mark Wheeller, Berkoff and Brecht were frequently seen. There was an increase in challenging texts being performed with high levels of understanding and often considerable style, ranging from Shakespeare and Marlowe to Pinter and Churchill. Some interesting work was seen from genres such as Victorian Melodrama or Theatre of the Absurd.

In general, extracts could be poorly chosen and were less successful than when candidates communicated a sense of the whole text. However, some extracts do make a coherent performance.

The centre must provide in advance a copy of the text as performed. Many centres also provided notes that gave an insight into the interpretation. This was excellent practice and is encouraged for future series.

Scripted work was often overlong and candidates lost focus and pace. Centres are reminded that marks can only be awarded within the time limits of this paper. Examiners felt that some of this work was being used in another context and did not meet the requirements of this paper.

## The Third Way

There was a large increase in centres choosing this option. A play text is used as the stimulus and the final performance includes both devised and scripted scenes. Much of the work was of a high standard and the approach was felt to be supportive of the full range of candidates.

## Performance Support

As in all previous series this is the least chosen option. Many examiners report seeing no performance support candidates this year. There was some very weak work and often these candidates had no supporting evidence and refused to do a presentation. Some did not attend at all or left the exam before their group performance.

It was felt that there was a noticeable improvement in how well candidates had been prepared for the presentations and support materials. There was evidence of in depth research, a sense of working with the performers and available resources in order to produce in performance a contribution that reflects 40% of a GCSE course.

Lighting and costume were the most popular choices. Set design sometimes had many interesting ideas that could not be realised in performance and so could not be awarded marks.



The majority of performance groups work without a Performance Support candidate but still use sound, set, lighting and costume to enhance their performance.

High scoring work was felt to show some of these features:

- Well taught with close reference to the specification and ICE 2006.
- Reflected standard of 40% of a 5 term GCSE course.
- Met all five criteria.
- Performed with a sense of occasion to a suitable audience.
- Understood that the performance was an examination.
- Communicated with enthusiasm, passion and commitment.
- Well prepared and presented.

Middle scoring work was felt to show some of these features:

- Often well taught but candidates had not put in enough individual effort.
- Erratic attendance had hampered group achievement.
- Inappropriate stimulus material given.
- Too little teacher input during preparation.
- Too little preparation time.
- Too long preparation time.
- Poor choice of text for candidate's ability.
- Brief or overlong performances.

Low scoring work was felt to be:

- Under prepared, some improvised on the day.
- Poor attendance by group members.
- Under or over confident performers.
- Unsuitable material.
- Little understanding of creating live performance.
- Often very brief.
- Did not meet all criteria.

### Consortium Centres

Again this year there were some difficulties with centres that had not completed the Consortium Information Forms available in the ICE document. The completed forms must be sent to Edexcel as early as possible in the academic year. For all candidates being examined not in their registered home centre the examiner must be informed beforehand and 2 copies of a separate register must be provided giving full details of 'home' centre name, number, candidate name and number. This information must also be detailed on the DVD or videotape.

## Conclusion

As in previous reports the concerns detailed in this report could be addressed if all centres referred closely to the Specification and ICE documentation.

Centres are reminded that Edexcel offers a national programme of Inset courses led by members of the Senior Examining Team. Details have been sent to centres or are available with booking details on the Edexcel website.

The report has highlighted examiners' concerns in some detail but overall it was felt that 2006 was the best year of this specification in all aspects. Even non-specialist staff were felt to be enabling candidates to achieve. Low marks were often symptomatic of pupil disaffection rather than centre inadequacy. However, it was often mentioned by teachers and rightly ignored by examiners, that this was the only GCSE taken by some students

This is a specification that has the flexibility for the widest range of candidates to achieve and all teachers to bring their own skills and enthusiasms to the delivery of Paper Two. Examiners report on the great pleasure it gives them to work with all those involved in this examination. Above all, this remains a qualification that truly supports the education of young people and goes some way in valuing their current lives and experiences and preparing them for their futures in an uncertain 21<sup>st</sup> Century.

## Statistics

### Grade Boundaries 2006

Grade	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Mark	97	87	75	64	52	40	29	18	0

Further copies of this publication are available from  
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467  
Fax 01623 450481

Email [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code UG017693 Summer 2006

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit [www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications](http://www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications)  
Alternatively, you can contact Customer Services at [www.edexcel.org.uk/ask](http://www.edexcel.org.uk/ask) or on 0870 240 9800

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750  
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH