Marking Grid

FACTUAL CONTENT	EVALUATION
8 Full range of relevant, well-chosen factual information and evidence. Does not need to include every possible detail, but should reflect a very sound overview.	**8** Full (though not necessarily exhaustive) evaluation showing depth of understanding of what the question is asking. This score should reflect the candidate's ability to make a coherent argument, with regular evaluative commentary. QWC should be sound.
6-7 Good range of relevant factual information and evidence. Some significant point(s) may have been omitted but there will still be a solid range.	**6-7** Good evaluation of the question but there will be a lack of depth. There may be some incoherence and some weaknesses in structure and expression.
4-5 Reasonable range of factual information and evidence. There will be some noticeable gaps in anticipated facts and some additional factual detail that lacks relevance.	**4-5** Reasonable evaluation of the question but with some incoherence and lack of depth. There may also be some weaknesses in structure and expression.
2-3 Some relevant factual information and evidence, but significant gaps in knowledge.	**2-3** Some evaluation but lacks coherence and does not address the question consistently. There may also be significant weaknesses in structure and expression.
1 Little relevant factual information.	**1** Little understanding or evaluation of the question.
0 No relevant factual information / evidence from the text.	**0** No argument delivered in answer to the question. May be a few wide generalisations only.

- Put marks at the end of each essay as *FC mark + E mark* and then ring the total as the mark for the complete essay.
- If an essay is good, don't be afraid to award full marks on either column. These are GCSE level only!
- Conversely, don't get carried away with a candidate who knows a lot of details (high FC) but doesn't argue the case (low E).
- Remember that the levels may be very different on each column.
- Remember that you are awarding factual content marks on range and relevance. Watch that you don't over-reward lots of corroborative details on the same point or lots of interestingly accurate facts that don't focus on the question.