Further Guidance on Reassessment Protocols – 2018/19

For the coming round of meetings of Boards of Examiners the following principles should be applied:

Use of the Two Reassessment Methods

1. Where reassessment is required, students should be reassessed according to the method set out in the relevant module specification;

1.1 Where the ‘Like-for-Like’ method is used, it is intended that students who fail should retake the assessments for the module that they failed or a composite form of assessment, the mark for which will be recorded against the relevant failed individual pieces of assessment (Nb. See 1.1.3 below); marks for any elements of assessment that were not failed will be carried forward;

1.1.1 Where a student is referred, the maximum mark that can be achieved will be pass mark for the module;

1.1.2 Where a student is deferred, the final mark achieved will be the aggregate of the elements of assessment for which a mark of pass has been recorded either at the original attempt or the AFT attempt;

1.1.3 However, given the complexities of managing on SDS a method of reassessment designed for use on KentVision, it has been agreed that this year under the ‘Like-for-Like method where a student has failed a module overall but the aggregated top rank coursework mark on SDS is a pass, then a coursework retrieval will not be required.

1.2 Where the ‘Single Instrument’ method is used, students who fail a module will be reassessed by the designated single piece of assessment that has been selected by the School for this purpose;

1.2.1 Where a student is referred, the maximum mark that can be achieved will be pass mark for the module;

1.2.2 Where a student is deferred, it is intended that that the mark achieved for the single piece of assessment at the AFT attempt will become the final mark for the module;

1.2.3 However, in recognition that use of this method may potentially prove disadvantageous to students under some scenarios (e.g. where good coursework marks achieved at the original attempt would be overwritten by the single mark achieved at the AFT attempt and it had in previous years been the practice of the Board to aggregate the marks from both attempts in order to arrive at the final mark for the module) the University has agreed that with respect to currently registered students the following procedure should be carried out:

• The School should calculate the difference between the mark as it stands (using the reassessment instrument) and the mark as it would have been derived by the School in previous years (carrying forward any relevant marks and using the reassessment instrument to supplement the deferral result), where such had been the established practice within the School in previous years;
In such cases, the reassessment method which yields the higher result should be used and this calculation and process must be clearly recorded on the composite marksheet (or exam board marksheet), in order that the final module mark on SDS can be updated.

Other Relevant Points:

2. Where a deferred student repeats a module or modules AFT in attendance, the marks achieved at the original attempt are struck from the record and will be replaced by the marks achieved when the module is repeated as if for the first time. This is not a change.

3. For modules operating the ‘Like-for-Like’ method, the final mark for the module will be arrived at by aggregating (i) the marks for the components for which a pass was achieved at the first attempt and (ii) the marks achieved at the second attempt for those components which originally were failed.

Please note that where a component is failed at both attempts the final module mark awarded for the second attempt will not be calculated by importing the mark for that component from the earlier attempt, even where the original mark was higher. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CW</th>
<th>Lab</th>
<th>Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attempt 1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempt 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>[40]</td>
<td>0 (no show)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under this scenario, the original mark of 38 for the exam would not be imported into attempt 2 and so would not feature in the calculation of the final module mark for that attempt. The mark of zero would be used.

In short, this means you do not carry forward the better fail mark for a component between attempts.

4. Schools should record decisions on reassessment for the students for which they hold the responsibility for doing so. Where their students have taken modules owned by other Schools consultation will be required with these Schools about what the appropriate reassessment decision would be.

5. It had become clear that the opening sentence on the section on deferral in the Guidance for Examiners document (clause 13.1) (pasted below) had become a source of confusion, as on reflection, while it is broadly true, it is no longer strictly true in every scenario, i.e. where the reassessment method for the module has been preselected by the school as by single instrument:

“Where a student has failed due to circumstances such as illness, and where there is written evidence to support this, the Board of Examiners may permit the student to undertake some or all of the assessment for some or all of the failed modules comprising the stage at a later date.”

The text has now been revised, so that it now echoes the similar passage published in the Guidance under ‘Referral: 10.1’, which benefitted from a more straightforward formulation. In the interests of providing clarity, the text at 13.1 now reads:
“Where a student has failed due to circumstances such as illness, and where there is written evidence to support this, the Board of Examiners may permit the student to undertake further assessment for some or all of the failed modules comprising the stage at a later date.”