



Review of Marking Policy

The core principle that guides everything we do is **Putting Students First**.

Purpose and scope

Gordon's School is committed to ensuring that whenever staff mark candidates' work, this is done fairly, consistently and in accordance with the relevant awarding body specification and subject specific guidance.

Marking and internal moderation

Candidates' work will be marked by staff who have appropriate knowledge, understanding and skills, who have been trained for this activity and who do not have any potential conflicts of interest. The school is committed to ensuring that work produced by candidates is authenticated in line with the requirements of the awarding body. Where more than one subject teacher is involved in marking candidates' work, internal moderation and standardisation will be used to ensure consistency of marking.

Informing candidates of marks

The school will ensure that candidates are informed of their centre assessed marks for relevant components so that they may request a review of the centre's marking before marks are submitted to the awarding body.

Access to marked work and materials

The school will inform candidates that they may request copies of relevant assessment materials (for example, copies of marked work, mark recording sheets, and any relevant assessment criteria) to assist them in considering whether to request a review of the centre's marking.

On receipt of a request for materials, the school will promptly make them available to the candidate. This will either be the originals viewed under supervised conditions or copies.

The school will provide candidates with sufficient time, normally at least five working days, to allow them to review the materials and reach a decision about whether to request a review of marking.

Timeframes and deadlines

1. The school will provide a clear deadline for candidates to submit a request for a review of the centre's marking. Requests will not be accepted after this deadline. Requests must be made in writing (including by email), and candidates must explain on what grounds they wish to request a review, i.e. which type of 'marking error' they believe has occurred.

Grounds for requesting a review

2. A reviewer will be instructed to consider whether the candidate's mark is consistent with the centre's marking standard. The reviewer is required to correct any marking error. The three types of marking error are:
 - an administrative error
 - Example: The total mark has been added up incorrectly, or the wrong mark has been transferred to the mark sheet.
 - a failure to apply the marking criteria to the evidence generated by the candidate where that failure did not involve the exercise of academic judgement
 - Example: A whole section of work that clearly meets a particular band in the mark scheme has not been awarded any marks because it was overlooked.
 - an unreasonable exercise of academic judgement
 - Example: The teacher has awarded marks that are clearly out of line with how similar work has been marked in the group, or the mark is obviously inconsistent with the descriptors in the mark scheme.

Candidates *must* select at least one of these grounds to support their application for a review and explain the way(s) in which they believe the marking error has occurred.

Review procedure and reviewer requirements

3. The school will allow sufficient time for the review to be carried out, for any necessary changes to marks to be made, and for the candidate to be informed of the outcome, all before the awarding body's deadline for the submission of marks.
4. The school will ensure that the review of marking is conducted by an assessor who has appropriate competence, has had no previous involvement in the assessment of that candidate for the component in question and has no personal interest in the outcome of the review.
5. The school will instruct the reviewer to ensure that the candidate's mark is consistent with the standard set by the centre. It is for the centre to determine whether any difference in marking is within any tolerances such as the centre would allow during its internal standardisation process.
6. If the reviewer decides that there has been a marking error, they will indicate where the marking error has occurred and how/why the original mark is not in line with the standard applied to other candidates at the centre.

Outcomes and communication to candidates

7. The school will inform the candidate in writing of the outcome of the review of the centre's marking, and will explain whether the mark has changed and, if so, why.

Records and oversight by head of centre

8. The outcome of the review of marking will be made known to the head of centre. A written record of the review will be kept and made available to the awarding body upon request.

Final marks submitted to awarding bodies

9. The centre retains responsibility for the mark that is submitted to the awarding body. Where the centre decides, in light of all available evidence (including the reviewer's findings), not to accept a reviewed mark, the head of centre will determine the final mark to be submitted. In such cases, the student will be informed of the mark being submitted and that the school has not adopted the reviewed mark.
10. Once this internal review process is concluded and marks have been submitted to the awarding body, there is no further internal review or appeal process open to candidates. Candidates may, however, have access to the awarding body's post results services (for example, review of marking) after the issue of results, in line with awarding body and JCQ procedures.

Relationship to awarding body moderation and post results services

The moderation process carried out by the awarding body may result in a mark change, either upwards or downwards, even after an internal review.

The internal review process is in place to help ensure consistency of marking within the centre, whereas moderation by the awarding body ensures that the centre's marking is in line with national standards.

The mark submitted to the awarding body is therefore subject to change and should be regarded as provisional until final results are issued.

Ms J Pierce
Deputy Head Curriculum
September 2025

Reviewed: September 2026