



Guide to Post-Secondary Services

1. Introduction	3
2. Who undertakes the reviews of marking or moderation and how are they monitored? ..	4
3. How is a review conducted?	4
4.	

moderator) 'and only make a change to the mark where the marking of the assessment included a marking error'.

The role of the reviewer is to determine whether the original examiner/moderator has applied the mark scheme consistently, properly and fairly and whether the mark awarded was a reasonable mark. The review is not a re-mark or re-moderation exercise unless an error is identified with the original marking/moderation.

The reviewer will consider each task and the assessment as a whole and determine whether the original mark/grade could reasonably have been awarded. The reviewing process will:

- Determine if there has been an administrative error in the marking (e.g. a failure to mark part of the assessment or a calculation error)

- Determine whether the task is one where there is only a 'right' or 'wrong' mark or one which requires the exercise of academic judgement

- Determine if the correct mark has been given if there is only a 'right' or 'wrong' mark and correct the mark if an error has been made

- Determine, if academic judgement has been exercised, whether the marking contained any unreasonable exercise of academic judgement. Where this is found, the error will be corrected

If there is a change to the marks/grade, the reviewer will document the reasons. The reasons will be as follows:

- an administrative error

- the script was not marked fully in accordance with the mark scheme

- the original marking was unduly lenient

- the original marking was unduly strict

- the original marking was both unduly lenient and strict across different questions.

The reviewer will not change the marks unless there is a marking error.

4. What is a moderation or marking error?

A moderation error is defined as an outcome which could not reasonably have been arrived at given the candidate's work, the centre's marking of that work, the criteria against which candidates' performance is differentiated and WJEC's moderation procedures.

A marking error is defined as a mark which could not reasonably have been awarded to a candidate's responses when the mark scheme for the paper and other WJEC marking procedures are applied correctly.

requirement on centres to have an internal appeals procedure to enable candidates to appeal centre decisions prior to the submission of marks to WJEC.

In cases where centres have closed and are, therefore, no longer operating as a school/college when their former students receive their results, we will consider the best approach for affected students who need to apply for a review of marking.

6.

8.

One candidate's mark is changed from 50 to 43

One candidate's mark is changed from 80 to 83

Seven candidates' marks remain the same

*This is not considered for further investigation as there is no trend of significant mark changes. The centre has not requested applications for **at least 10% of the cohort**. There is evidence of two candidates' marks changing (in both an upward and a downward direction) **by more than 5% of the total raw mark for the paper**. However, the marks for one candidate have **moved by less than 5% of the total raw mark** and the remaining seven candidates' marks have remained the same.*

c) Centre 3

Centre 3 entered 20 candidates for GCE Biology and submits applications for a review of marking for one paper, marked out of 60, for 2 candidates.

The outcome of the review of marking is as follows:

One candidate's mark is changed from 40 to 44

One candidate's mark is changed from 50 to 43

*This is considered for further investigation. The centre has requested applications for **at least 10% of the cohort**. There is evidence of two candidates' marks changing (in both an upward and a downward direction) **by more than 5% of the total raw mark for the paper**. The centre is advised to submit further applications for a review of marking, selecting all candidates of concern, within five working days. The centre is reminded that consent is required for each candidate submitted for a review of marking, as marks can go up, down or remain the same. Centres cannot choose to accept mark changes in an upward direction and refuse any mark changes in a downward direction.*

d) Centre 4

Centre 4 entered 40 candidates for GCE Geography and submits applications for a review of marking for two papers, each marked out of 80, for 5 candidates.

The outcome of the review is as follows:

Paper 1

One candidate's mark is changed from 60 to 50

One candidate's mark is changed from 55 to 43.

One candidate's mark is changed from 37 to 28.

The mark for two candidates remains unchanged.

Paper 2

All five candidates' marks remain unchanged.

*Paper 1 is considered for further investigation. The centre has requested applications **for at least 10% of the cohort**. There is evidence of three candidates' marks **changing by more than 10% of the total mark for the paper**. The centre is advised to submit further applications for a review of marking, selecting all candidates of concern, within five working days. The centre is reminded that consent is required for each candidate submitted for a review of marking, as marks can go up, down or remain the same. Centres cannot choose to accept mark changes in an upward direction and refuse any mark changes in a downward direction.*

Paper 2 is not considered for further investigation as there is no trend of significant mark changes.