

# Post-Results Services Policy

**September 2026**

## Contents

|     |                                                                                                |   |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 1.  | <a href="#">Scope</a>                                                                          | 3 |
| 1.1 | <a href="#">Definitions of post-results services</a>                                           | 3 |
| 1.2 | <a href="#">Access to scripts</a>                                                              | 3 |
| 1.3 | <a href="#">Candidate permission</a>                                                           | 3 |
| 2.  | <a href="#">How reviews of marking or moderation are undertaken and how they are monitored</a> | 4 |
| 3.  | <a href="#">How a review of marking or moderation is conducted</a>                             | 4 |
| 4.  | <a href="#">Definition of a marking or moderation error</a>                                    | 5 |
| 5.  | <a href="#">How to apply for a review of marking or moderation</a>                             | 6 |
| 6.  | <a href="#">Issuing of decision letters</a>                                                    | 6 |
| 7.  | <a href="#">Appeals</a>                                                                        | 7 |
| 8.  | <a href="#">Marking concerns and further investigations</a>                                    | 7 |
| 9.  | <a href="#">Further advice</a>                                                                 | 7 |
| 10. | <a href="#">Version control &amp; policy review</a>                                            | 8 |
|     | <a href="#">Appendix: Examples</a>                                                             | 9 |

# Post-Results Services Policy

## 1. Scope

This policy is for centres, candidates and parents/guardians to provide an understanding of the post-results services requirements. This policy applies to all WJEC qualifications, including those under the Eduqas brand.

WJEC, as a member of the Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ), follows the JCQ guidelines for post-results services as detailed in '[Post Results Services](#)'. This guidance is followed by all JCQ Awarding Organisations and ensures consistent application of the requirements. This policy should be read in conjunction with the JCQ guidance, with the requirement that centres adhere to both documents.

WJEC is committed to ensuring that all candidates' results are issued accurately on results day. We have quality assurance processes to ensure that results are accurate as documented on our [WJEC](#) and [Eduqas](#) websites.

The deadlines and fees are published in the Post-Results Services Fees and Deadlines booklet on our [WJEC](#) and [Eduqas](#) websites. T level deadlines and fees are published in the Key Documents section of the [subject page](#). Review of marking applications cannot be made after the deadline date.

### 1.1 Definitions of post-results services

We realise that errors can occur and we want to ensure that our post-results services correct any errors in a timely manner. The services are as follows:

- Service 1: A clerical re-check
- Service 2: A review of marking, a clerical re-check and a statement of the marks by unit/component for an individual candidate
- Service 3: A review of moderation, if we've changed centre marks during moderation (this service is not available for individual candidates)
- Access to scripts (see section 1.2)

### 1.2 Access to scripts

Centres can download scripts on behalf of candidates from WJEC's secure website which also includes the instructions on this process.

Centres must obtain the candidate's permission prior to downloading a script. Scripts will be available to download from results day for 6 months.

### 1.3 Candidate permission

Centres must obtain written consent from a candidate prior to submitting a request for a clerical re-check and review of marking as the candidate's mark and grade may go up, down or remain the same. The request cannot, under any circumstances, be cancelled once the outcome has been issued by WJEC.

Candidate consent is not required for a review of moderation as the original grade will not be lowered. However, candidates and centres should be aware that a lowered mark would be carried forward to future certification.

If a centre wishes to cancel an application before the outcome has been issued they must contact [prs@wjec.co.uk](mailto:prs@wjec.co.uk) in a timely manner, noting that a cancellation fee may be applicable.

## 2. **How reviews of marking or moderation are undertaken and how they are monitored**

WJEC appoints reviewers who are experienced senior examiners or moderators. WJEC maintains a register of interests for all its appointees which ensures that a reviewer does not have a conflict of interest when undertaking the reviewing role. The reviewer is a different individual to the original examiner or moderator.

All reviewers undertake compulsory training in their reviewing role to ensure that they are fully cognisant of the standard set during the examination series. In addition to this, the training ensures that they understand the unique role of the reviewer in relation to correcting errors of marking or moderation within the regulatory framework provided.

WJEC carefully monitors all reviewers by:

- ensuring that all reviewers have been trained on the standard set at the original standardisation conference prior to starting any reviews of marking/moderation;
- ensuring that all reviewers are adhering to the Guidance for Reviewers which meet the requirements of the regulatory conditions, particularly in relation to ensuring that only marking/moderation errors are corrected;
- scrutinising the number of mark changes that have been made and recording any issues that have been identified with the performance of examiners/moderators.

If, during the monitoring, WJEC identifies that a reviewer is not conducting their role correctly, we will take action to correct the situation. This may include re-training or re-allocating the reviews to another reviewer.

## 3. **How a review of marking or moderation is conducted**

The reviewer will be provided with a copy of a candidate's script or work that has been moderated, a copy of the mark scheme, the original mark and annotations. Regulator conditions require WJEC to 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 across the whole assessment 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. **Definition of a marking or moderation 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.

A moderation or marking error can occur as a result of:

- an administrative error
- a failure to apply the mark scheme where a task has only a 'right' or 'wrong' answer
- an unreasonable exercise of academic judgement.

An error can occur, for example, if an examiner has not properly applied the mark scheme or has not marked a creditworthy response. However, in many assessments, such as essays in English or History, there is not a 'right mark' and a 'wrong mark'. These types of assessments require examiners/moderators to use their academic judgement. Two trained examiners/moderators exercising their academic judgement reasonably and without making a mistake, could award different marks to the same candidate's answer and this is not considered to be an error.

In accordance with regulatory requirements, WJEC will always change a mark if there has been an error but will not change one reasonable mark for an alternative mark in the case of a difference of academic judgement. WJEC's starting point for considering whether there has been an exercise of academic judgement is always the mark which is being challenged (and not any alternative mark which the learner/Centre considers should have been awarded).

Examples of an unreasonable application of academic judgement include:

- marking which is unduly strict or lenient beyond the bounds of what might reasonably be expected of a trained examiner/moderator properly applying the mark scheme
- where part of an answer was not given a mark but where a trained and knowledgeable examiner/moderator acting reasonably should have given a mark
- where the marking of an answer suggests that the examiner/moderator had no rationale for his/her awarding of marks.

## 5. How to apply for a review of marking or moderation

Applications for **all** internal candidates must be made by a candidate's centre using WJEC's Portal. We cannot accept applications for reviews of marking directly from any internal candidates or their parents/guardians.

Private candidates should seek advice and apply through their entering centre but they may also apply directly by e-mailing our Post Results Service at [prs@wjec.co.uk](mailto:prs@wjec.co.uk) stating the candidate name, candidate number, centre name and number in any correspondence.

For internally assessed units we will only review the sample considered in the original moderation decision and only if marks have been adjusted. Therefore, we will only accept applications for reviews of moderation from centres, and not directly from candidates or their parents/guardians. Permission from candidates is not required as grades are protected. However, marks may go up or down and have an impact in the event of a carry-forward of marks to a subsequent series.

There is a requirement for 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/provider when their former students receive their results, candidates should follow the advice above for private candidates. These are the only circumstances in which WJEC will consider a request from an internal candidate directly.

## 6. Issuing of decision outcomes

WJEC will provide the outcome of a review of marking to a candidate's centre or directly to the candidate in the case of private candidates. If there has been a marking error, we will report the change of mark, the change in grade (if applicable) and the reason. The reasons for a change in mark/grade are categorised as:

- 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.

In the case of a review of moderation, WJEC will provide the centre with a report on the review of moderation, regardless of whether the outcome is changed or remains the same.

## 7. Appeals

If it is considered that an error remains following the review of marking or moderation process, centres may submit an application for appeal against the outcome of a review of marking or moderation as outlined in [WJEC's Appeals policy](#) and the [JCQ Appeals process document](#).

Appeals **must be made within 30 calendar days** of WJEC issuing the outcome of the clerical re-check, review of marking or review of moderation. If the reasons for the outcome, and/or a copy of the script(s) have been provided within 15 calendar days of the awarding organisation issuing the outcome, an application for an appeal **must still be submitted within 30 calendar days** of receiving it.

A private candidate may submit an appeal against the outcome of a review of marking by e-mailing [appeals@wjec.co.uk](mailto:appeals@wjec.co.uk), stating the candidate name, candidate number, centre name and number in any correspondence.

## 8. Marking concerns and further investigations

Throughout the review of marking period, WJEC monitors the review outcomes to assess whether there are any concerns which require further investigation. Our monitoring process includes identifying 'significant mark changes'.

Significant mark changes are defined as either:

- half, or more, of the applications (which must comprise at least 10% of the centre's entire cohort) submitted for one specific component or unit changing by more than 5% of the total raw mark available for the specific assessment
- OR
- a quarter, or more, of the applications (which must comprise at least 10% of the centre's entire cohort) submitted for one specific component or unit changing by more than 10% of the total raw mark available for the specific assessment.

If we identify significant mark changes on a specific component or unit, the centre will be advised by WJEC to submit further applications for reviews of marking **within five working days**, selecting all candidates of concern. However, the centre must receive consent from each candidate selected for a review of marking as marks can go up, down or remain the same.

The appendix provides examples to demonstrate situations where WJEC would and would not consider further investigative action.

## 9. Further advice

Centres should refer to this policy and the [JCQ guidance](#) in the first instance. If further support or advice is required, centres can contact WJEC's Post-Results Services Team either via email to [prs@wjec.co.uk](mailto:prs@wjec.co.uk), or by telephone on 01443 845619.

## 10. Version control and policy review date

**Policy Owner: Assistant Director: Operational Delivery**

| Version Control | Date           | Role                                    | Changes                                                        | Next Review |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1.0             | September 2026 | Assistant Director: Policy & Regulation | Creation of Policy document (transfer from Post Results Guide) | June 2027   |

## Appendix

Examples to demonstrate situations where WJEC would and would not consider further investigative action are shown below.

### a) Centre 1

Centre 1 entered 50 candidates for GCSE Drama, and submits applications for a review of marking for one paper, marked out of 80, for 5 candidates. One candidate's mark is changed from 50 to 53, as a result of the review of marking. The marks for the other four candidates remain unchanged.

This is not considered for further investigation as there is no trend of significant mark changes. Although the centre has requested applications for at least 10% of the cohort, the marks have changed for only one candidate. **Additionally, the mark has not changed by more than 5% of the total raw mark available for the specific assessment.**

### b) Centre 2

Centre 2 entered 200 candidates for GCSE English language and submits applications for a review of marking for one paper, marked out of 100, for 10 candidates.

The outcome of the review of marking is as follows:

- One candidate's mark is changed from 70 to 76.
- 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.