

Notional Component Grade Boundaries

Edexcel GCSE (9-1)

November 2024

Understanding linear component raw marks and subject marks

Components of International GCSE and reformed GCSE, AS and A level qualifications are all sat at the end of the course. Components are individual assessments, such as examinations or non-exam assessments (NEA), which each make up a linear qualification. These qualifications are all linear rather than modular, which means that there is no longer a need for the UMS marks you will have been familiar with in the past.

The component structure of qualifications

In linear qualifications, each component has a total raw mark. The components contribute a certain percentage to the qualification mark overall, but the contribution of the components may not be equal. This is because one component may represent a larger part of the qualification than the others (see example 2, below). When the contribution of components to the qualification is not equal, the component raw marks, when simply added together, may not reflect the percentage contribution of the components to the qualification. In such cases the raw mark for the assessment is scaled up or down by a weighting factor. The raw mark is multiplied by the weighting factor so that it reflects the contribution of the component mark to the qualification.

The scaled marks, known as subject marks, are then added together to form the overall subject mark.

Two examples are given below.

Example 1: no scaling is needed as the total raw mark for each component reflects the percentage contribution of each to the qualification.

The total raw marks of all components in a linear qualification will add up to the total subject mark **if** they all contribute to the qualification equally.

| Component Title | Raw Marks | Contribution to the Qualification | Weighting Factor | Total Scaled Mark |
|---------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Paper 1 | 50 | 25% | 1.000 | 50 |
| Paper 2 | 50 | 25% | 1.000 | 50 |
| Paper 3 | 50 | 25% | 1.000 | 50 |
| Paper 4 | 50 | 25% | 1.000 | 50 |
| Subject max mark | 200 | 100% | | 200 |

Example 2: scaling is needed as the raw mark for one or more components does not reflect the percentage contribution.

| Component Title | Raw marks | Contribution to the qualification | Weighting Factor | Total Scaled mark |
|---------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Paper 1 | 60 | 35% | 1.458 | 87.5 |
| Paper 2 | 45 | 20% | 1.111 | 50 |
| Paper 3 | 45 | 25% | 1.389 | 62.5 |
| Paper 4 | 50 | 20% | 1.000 | 50 |
| Subject max mark | | 100% | | 250 |

How candidates' grades are determined

Table 1 – candidates sitting the qualification in example 1

| Component title | Marks for candidate A | Mark for candidate B |
|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Paper 1 | 10 | 40 |
| Paper 2 | 25 | 15 |
| Paper 3 | 30 | 20 |
| Paper 4 | 20 | 10 |
| Subject mark | 85 | 85 |

Since the marks for each component in the qualification represent the correct percentage contribution, the component marks are simply added to give the overall subject mark. In this example, both candidates A and B have achieved 85 marks for the overall subject. Since they both have the same subject mark, candidates A and B will receive the same grade even though their component performances are very different.

Suppose the subject grade boundaries were 81 marks for a grade C and 93 marks for a grade B. Since a subject mark of 85 lies within this mark range, both candidates A and B will receive a grade C for the qualification.

Table 2 – candidates sitting the qualification in example 2

| Component title | Raw mark for candidate C | Weighting factor | Scaled mark |
|-----------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------------|
| Paper 1 | 12 | 1.458 | 17.496 |
| Paper 2 | 24 | 1.111 | 26.664 |
| Paper 3 | 31 | 1.389 | 43.059 |
| Paper 4 | 20 | 1.000 | 20.000 |
| | | Total: | 107.219 |
| | | Subject mark: | |

Table 2 shows the performance of candidate C in the example 2 qualification. The second column, 'Raw mark', shows the marks achieved on each of the four papers. Since the marks for the components must be scaled to represent the percentage contribution of each paper to the overall subject, the component marks must be scaled, using the weighting factor shown in column 3, to give the scaled mark shown in column 4 of the table. The scaled marks are totalled to give 107.291 which is, as a final step, rounded to the nearest whole number to give the subject mark of 107.

Suppose the subject grade boundaries were 101 marks for a grade D and 115 marks for a grade C. Since a subject mark of 107 lies within this mark range, candidate C will receive a grade D for the qualification.

Please note that footnote 1, relating to the example 2 table, explains the need for the weighting factor and that the scaled marks are calculated to the third place of decimal.

The use of notional component grade boundaries

The above examples, showing the grades achieved by candidates A, B and C, illustrate that notional grade performance at component level plays no part in the determination of a qualification grade. In fact, table 1 shows that both candidates achieve the same subject mark even though their component performances are quite different. Given this, why are notional component grade boundaries published?

When the subject grade boundaries are recommended by the senior examiners, it helps them to consider the component performance for a candidate who will achieve, say, a borderline grade A by producing a borderline grade A performance on each component.

For teachers, the notional component grade boundaries can be useful as an indicator of grade performance when, for example, an examination paper is used as a future mock examination.

Linear qualifications and deciding whether to submit a post-results service (PRS) request

Component-level grade boundaries in these linear qualifications are notional only, and do not equate to a certificated grade.

When considering whether to submit a post-results service request, it is important to understand that notional grade boundaries - or how close a candidate may be to one - are not relevant.

A change in a notional component-level boundary may not equate to a subject grade change. For example, if a learner achieves Bs in each of the two components for a reformed AS level the component grade would be a B. If, after a review of marking, a component mark changes, and the notional grade increases from a B to an A, the overall AS subject grade may still remain a B when the component scores are combined*.

*if, when combined with the other component scores, the revised total equates to an A grade, the subject grade would be changed accordingly.

| English Language | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|-------------------------------|-----|----------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|
| Notion | al component grade boundaries | | Max Mark | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | U |
| 1EN0 | English Language | Raw | 64 | 53 | 49 | 46 | 41 | 37 | 33 | 25 | 18 | 11 | 0 |
| | Paper 01 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1EN0 | English Language | Raw | 96 | 79 | 73 | 68 | 62 | 56 | 51 | 39 | 27 | 15 | 0 |
| | Paper 02 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| English Language 2.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|-----|----------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|
| Notion | al component grade boundaries | | Max Mark | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | U |
| 1EN2 | English Language 2.0 | Raw | 80 | 72 | 67 | 62 | 55 | 48 | 41 | 31 | 21 | 12 | 0 |
| | Paper 01 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1EN2 | English Language 2.0 | Raw | 80 | 70 | 65 | 61 | 54 | 47 | 41 | 31 | 21 | 12 | 0 |
| | Paper 02 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Mather | natics | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------------------------|-----|----------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|
| Notion | al component grade boundaries | | Max Mark | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | U |
| 1MA1 | Mathematics (Foundation) | Raw | 80 | | | | | 58 | 47 | 34 | 22 | 10 | 0 |
| | Paper 1F | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1MA1 | Mathematics (Higher) | Raw | 80 | 67 | 57 | 47 | 36 | 25 | 15 | 10 | | | 0 |
| | Paper 1H | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1MA1 | Mathematics (Foundation) | Raw | 80 | | | | | 58 | 46 | 33 | 21 | 9 | 0 |
| | Paper 2F | | , | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1MA1 | Mathematics (Higher) | Raw | 80 | 67 | 56 | 46 | 35 | 24 | 14 | 9 | | | 0 |
| | Paper 2H | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1MA1 | Mathematics (Foundation) | Raw | 80 | | | | | 58 | 48 | 35 | 22 | 10 | 0 |
| | Paper 3F | | , | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1MA1 | Mathematics (Higher) | Raw | 80 | 66 | 56 | 47 | 36 | 25 | 14 | 8 | | | 0 |
| | Paper 3H | | | | | | | | | | | | |