

## POLICY FOR YEAR 1 SEMESTER 1 REWORKS

### Introduction and Rationale

Due to the academic regulations of Staffordshire University, students studying in Year 1, Semester 1 of an SU programme are provided with an additional attempt to bring a failed assignment up to a passing standard and have this assessed and dealt with as if it were the first attempt made by the student. This is called a rework, and must be offered to students in the period between the initial marking of student papers and the examination board. This rework does not require the creation of a new assessment paper and allows students a chance to make improvements to previously submitted work. BUV therefore require a policy which will allow us to provide this to students within the tight time constraints that we operate within.

### Validity

- This policy is valid for all BUV and SU degree programmes operating at BUV.
  - For programmes where cohorts consist of both dual award and own-degree students, this policy will be applied when students enter the first semester of the dual award programme and are subject to the policy of SU.
  - For programmes not linked to collaborative partners, this policy will be applied in the first semester of study at the university.
- It applies to all pre-seen assignment-based papers (including individual and group presentations) with the **exclusion of any examinations**.
- Any late submissions are not eligible for a rework opportunity.
- Any cases where a student did not submit their work are not eligible for a rework opportunity.
- In order to qualify for a rework opportunity, students must have made a 'genuine attempt' at the paper. Examples of non-genuine submissions which are not eligible include:
  - Blank submissions
  - Entirely irrelevant content
  - Question papers
  - Material with no value deemed by the first marker as having been made just for the sake of meeting the deadline

### Policy

#### 1. Pre-marking process

- 1.1. Any faculty involved in first/second marking for relevant modules are given reminders by the appropriate academic leadership about how the marking deadlines for these modules in particular must be adhered to.

#### 2. Marking process

- 2.1. First marker marks all papers following the guidelines set out in the; **BUV first marking guide**'.

- 2.2. When informing the Examinations Office (EO) that first marking is complete, a provisional list of Rework students must be provided in a table format by the first marker showing the student ID and the grade obtained at first marking.
  - 2.2.1. If this is not included, the EO will request this. This must be provided within 24 hours of notification of the completion of first marking.
- 2.3. Second marker performs second marking with a priority given to any failed grades and any grades marked between 40-45 (borderline cases which might be adjusted).
- 2.4. After second marker confirms the failed grades, a notification is sent to the EO by the first marker with a finalized list of any failing student papers.
- 2.5. A list of any additional failing papers which emerge during the second marking must be passed to the EO by the first marker, and meetings are arranged in line with 3.1.
  - 2.5.1. The EO must check with first markers that no additional rework students have been added to the list.

### 3. EO process

- 3.1. After receiving the provisional list of failing students, the EO checks to ensure that any students who submitted late or marked as non-submissions (NS) are removed from the list.
- 3.2. After receiving the final rework list, the EO arranges meetings between the ML and failing students. This meeting should occur within two working days of the list being submitted and meetings may be arranged as a group, subject to student and faculty availability.
- 3.3. Rework meetings will not be rescheduled if a student does not attend a scheduled meeting.
- 3.4. After the ML meets the student (and the paperwork is submitted to the EO), the relevant students are set up with a new submission deadline on Canvas and any relevant presentation slots are arranged.
- 3.5. A rework deadline of **four calendar days** from the date of the arranged meeting should be posted on Canvas.
- 3.6. If the student does not submit their rework by the set deadline, the original mark stands. No extensions or late submissions are allowed for the rework attempt.

### 4. Process following submission of reworked assessment

- 4.1. ML and second marker both have two working days for each stage to review and mark the reworked submissions. Only basic marking standards need to be met, and the fact that this is a reworked assessment should be noted in the general comments.
- 4.2. The EO will provide a list of the original grades for the reworked submission to act as a reference point for the marking of the reworked material.
- 4.3. If a reworked paper receives a lower grade than the original attempt, the higher scoring attempt will be recorded on exam grids.
  - 4.3.1. The only exception to this is if student is found to have committed academic misconduct. In this case, the submission will progress through the academic conduct procedure and any academic misconduct will be dealt with in the normal process, and these grades will be brought forward to all boards.

- 4.4. The reworked submission should replace the original submission for all further steps in the process, but original submissions should be downloaded and kept on file. Both original and reworked marks should be provided to fee payers/students and recorded by BUV.
- 4.5. The pre-QC process on the paper set is carried out by the EO.
- 4.6. QC is carried out on the entire paper set as usual.
- 4.7. Once confirmed at QC level, all marks are uploaded to SU.

## Exceptions and Caveats

### Submissions comprising multiple elements

If a module assessment comprises multiple elements in a portfolio style assessment, but only one overall grade is reported to SU, the rework is to be offered for all elements of that assessment that received a failing grade, unless those elements are late or NS.

For example, if an assessment is listed as 50% on a Module Descriptor, but this comprises multiple individual elements, if a student receives a score of under 40, they can choose to rework any valid failing element of that one assessment in order to improve their grade.

### Academic misconduct

In any cases where students have failed their first submission, but academic misconduct is also suspected and reported during the marking process, the rework is not offered to students until this has been resolved. In cases where misconduct is proven, the student is not offered a rework. In cases where misconduct is not proven, the student is offered a rework in line with the above policy.

Any reported academic misconduct is dealt with as per 4.3.1 above.

### Choice of rework

Students under no obligation to carry out a rework. If there are multiple components to a module which are available for rework, module leaders should advise that students should attempt every rework available to them. Students only get one offer to carry out a rework, and in all cases of assessments which qualify for consideration under the above process, meetings and deadlines should be arranged for students as per the policy.

### Group based assessments

For group-based submissions and presentation, it is feasible that there may be disagreement between members of the original group as to whether they wish to rework the submission, or a lack of availability of some members.

In these cases, any student wishing to be involved in reworking a group submission must independently submit their work in the appropriate manner. The rework will still be a group-based assessment, and students are allowed to collaborate on the work, but any students not submitting revised work or attending the presentation will receive the original mark.

Faculty members are ~~require~~ required to mark only **one** example of each reworked group assessment, and all students in the group will receive the same mark.

#### Changelog:

June 2022

- Clarification of no reworks for multi-element submissions that are late, NS, or received a mark of 40 or above.
- Clarification of group submissions and marking.

Valid from: June 2022

Prepared by: Head of Quality and Academic  
Development

Reviewed by: Quality Assurance Committee

Approved by: Deputy Chief Academic Officer