

LTC15D048

Title: Second interim evaluative report following the implementation of the Bachelors and Integrated Masters award regulations
Author: Head of Learning and Teaching Services, Caroline Sauverin
Circulation: Learning & Teaching Committee – 2 December 2015
Agenda: LTC15A002
Version: Final
Status: Open

Issue

With the introduction of the Bachelors and Integrated Masters (BIM) regulations there was a commitment to review its implementation periodically. The report is a summary of outcomes following the second year of implementation.

Recommendation

Members are asked to note the findings, consider what further analysis would be useful and the mechanisms for further consideration.

Resource Implications

N/A

Risk Implications

N/A

Equality and Diversity

N/A

Timing of decisions

No decisions are required.

Further Information

Caroline Sauverin, Head of LTS

1. Introduction and Background

- 1.1. This report follows the first interim review of the introduction of the new regulations, reported to LTC in May 2015. It includes the outcomes and outputs following the second year of implementation of the Bachelors and Integrated Masters award regulations.
- 1.2. The background surrounding the introduction of the new regulations was set out in the first report, link below, for reference:

<https://portal.uea.ac.uk/documents/6207125/8985662/ltc14d187dividerd.pdf/971a08aa-c81c-41da-b735-e6c2df5b8772>

2. Process

2.1. The following information was collated and used in this review:

1. Concessions granted against the regulations
 2. Progression outcomes compared to previous years:
 - The number of students undertaking reassessment
 - The number of students who subsequently failed reassessment and were required to withdraw due to academic failure
 - The number of students who had a concession to repeat a period of study at level 0 and level 4.
 - Dropouts during the year
 - The number of students who had module marks within 0.5% of a pass mark and therefore were not required to go to reassessment in those modules.
 - The number of students who had a mark of less than 20% at first attempt and their final outcome for the year¹.
 3. Change to assessment strategies
 - The proportion of assessment which is formative compared to summative;
 - The number of exams;
 - The total number of assessments.
- 2.2. Exclusions from the second interim report (will not be measured until the first finalists have graduated):

NSS scores

Classification outcomes

Employability impacts

OIA Judgements (there haven't been any for students studying under the first or second year of BIM regulations)

3. Results

¹ Although all first-year students who failed modules will be given a reassessment opportunity, second-year students will have to obtain an overall module mark of 20% to have an *automatic* right to reassessment.

3.1. Concessions considered by the Academic Director of Taught Programmes (ADTP) against the regulations

Table One: BIM-Related concession requests from September 2013 Source: M Pavey, LTS Manager

Up to 20 February 2015 (previously reported)	
Request	Outcome
NBS 400Y: Three pieces of coursework (including presentation) to be reassessed as one reflective essay	Rejected- but approval of combination of two of the pieces, excluding the presentation, granted.
Request for an individual student to have a module mark of below 39.5 condoned as a pass	Rejected
Request to allow 10 credit modules on the BSc Actuarial Science degree. The Course Director is citing concerns relating to professional body accreditation with the current composition of two 20 credit modules.	Rejected (only such request received to date)
Request for 4 HUM Foundation Students to be permitted to proceed despite having failed a compulsory language programme	Approved, on the understanding that the course be changed in subsequent years.
Request for students not making the 55% aggregate in Year 1 to be allowed to progress onto the second year of a four year programme, rather than be taken off routes which have a year abroad (AMS and LAW)	Approved (with recommendation that this BIM requirement is reviewed)
From 20 February 2015 to 30 October 2015	
Year 0,1, 2 and 3 Maths modules to be synoptically reassessed by examination	Approved by ADTP
Request for an ENV year 1 student with EC's to proceed to year 2 with 1 failed module	Rejected by ADTP
Request to allow 10 credit modules on the BSc Actuarial Science degree (professional body requirements)	Approved by ADTP
Students on Introduction to Visual Cultures who failed the presentation element to be permitted to record a presentation at home and submit via memory stick, drop box or CD with a copy of their slides	Approved by ADTP
AMA and LAW first year students on a four year programme with a Year Abroad, not to be required to obtain an overall year aggregate of 55% as required under BIM but to be allowed to progress into Year 2 of the 4 year route with an aggregate of 40% or more.	Approved by ADTP for 2014/15 and 2015/16 (had already been approved in 2013/14)
Law UG students to be permitted take a level 4 language	Approved by ADTP for 2013/14 to

module in their final year	2016/17
CMP student permitted to progress to Year in Industry notwithstanding an outstanding reassessment, which will be undertaken in May/June 2016.	Approved by ADTP

3.2. Progression outcomes for Stage One students

Table Two:

Progression Statistics for Stage One Students 2012/3, 2013/4 and 2014/5

Source: SPI SITS codes, analysed by Planning Office

Summary	2012/3 (pre-BIM)		2013/4		2014/5	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
STAGE ONE						
Students progressing	2494	89.6	2490	87.6	2423	90.2
Students not continuing at UEA	257	9.2	290	10.2	184	6.8
Others (repeat, intercalation, delayed sits)	31	1.1	63	2.2	80	3.0
Total	2782		2843		2687	

Detail	2012/3		2013/4		2014/5	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Progressing at first attempt	2291	82.4	2128	74.9	1942	72.3
Referred to reassessment	263	9.5	463	16.3	434	16.2
Progressed after reassessment	189	6.8	340	12.0	305	11.4
Academic fail following reassessment	35	1.3	46	1.6	64	2.4
Withdrawn following reassessment	17	0.6	16	0.6	10	0.4
Dropped out during the year	205	7.4	228	8.0	110	4.1
Permitted to repeat following first sit	5	0.2	3	0.1	3	0.1
Permitted to repeat following reassessment	5	0.2	20	0.7	16	0.6
Transferred within UEA	14	0.5	22	0.8	176	6.6
Deferred result (delayed sit, intercalation)	21	0.8	40	1.4	61	2.3
Total number of students	2782	100	2843	100.0	2687	100.0

3.3. Progression outcomes for Stage Two students

Table Three: Progression Statistics for Stage Two Students 2013/4 (pre-BIM) and 2014/5

Summary	2013/4 (pre-BIM)		2014/5	
	Number	%	Number	%
Students progressing	2857	91.8	2579	93.2
Students not continuing at UEA	120	3.9	61	2.2
Others (repeat, intercalation, delayed sits)	136	4.4	126	4.6
Total	3113		2766	

Detail	2013/4		2014/5	
	Number	%	Number	%
Progressing at first attempt	2636	84.7	2230	80.6
Referred to reassessment	272	8.7	352	12.7
Progressed after reassessment	176	5.7	250	9.0
Academic fail	19	0.6	9	0.3
Withdrawn following reassessment	11	0.4	4	0.1
Dropped out during the year	90	2.9	48	1.7
Permitted to repeat following first sit	30	1.0	8	0.3
Permitted to repeat following reassessment	28	0.9	47	1.7
Transferred within UEA	45	1.4	99	3.6
Deferred result (delayed sit, intercalation)	78	2.5	71	2.6
Total number of students	3113	100.0	2766	100.0

Notes on the progression outcomes data in Tables Two and Three:

1. *These tables were produced from SITS SPI (Student Progression Information) records for Undergraduate and Integrated Masters degree course students.*
2. *Nursing, midwifery and ODP courses are excluded from the data because of their in-year reassessment (as they have to pass all modules, the effect of this BIM introduction is minimal).*
3. *Visiting students, credit-only and certificate students are excluded.*

3.4. The number of students who had module marks within 0.5% of a pass mark and therefore were not required to go to reassessment in those modules

Table Four: Details of students who passed a module with a mark between 39.50 and 39.99% (Source: SITS SMR records)

Level of student	Number of Students 2013/4	Number of Students 2014/5
Foundation Year	2	0
Stage One	30	27
Stage Two	n/a	23

3.5. Students attaining a module mark of less than 20%.

Table Five: the number of students who had attained a module mark of less than 20% at their first attempt and their outcome at the end of the year.

Outcome	Ac Year	Foundation Year	Stage One	Stage Two	Total
Academic Fail	2014/5	3	9	19	31
	2013/4	15	44	n/a	59
Intercalating	2014/5	0	7	15	22
	2013/4	2	3	n/a	5
Repeat year	2014/5	2	4	24	30
	2013/4	0	5	n/a	5
Transfer and repeat same level on new course	2014/5	1	7	0	8
	2013/4	0	1	n/a	1
Progress	2014/5	0	0	0	0
	2013/4	0	0	n/a	0
Total	2014/5	6	27	58	91
	2013/4	17	53	n/a	70

3.6. Changes to assessment strategies

Table Six: Analysis of Assessment Types for Level 4 in 2013/4 and Levels 4 and 5 in 2014/5 and 2015/6
(Source: MAB data from SITS)

	2013/4		2014/5				2015/6 - provisional			
	Level 4	%	Level 4	%	Level 5	%	Level 4	%	Level 5	%
Total Summative	708	71	680	61	1234	66	650	60	1194	66
Total Formative	287	29	439	39	647	34	427	40	609	34
Summative detail										
Course Test	163	16.38	150	13.40	106	5.64	134	20.6	104	8.7
Exam - standard	88	8.84	90	8.04	195	10.37	86	13.2	187	15.7
Exam - other	8	0.80	9	0.80	23	1.22	6	0.9	24	2.0
OSCE	15	1.51	25	2.23	2	0.11	23	3.5	7	0.6
Practical	43	4.32	11	0.98	22	1.17	29	4.5	104	8.7
Project	25	2.51	29	2.59	130	6.91	29	4.5	104	8.7
Presentation	50	5.03	39	3.49	57	3.03	35	5.4	32	2.7
Written Assignment	285	28.64	289	25.83	652	34.66	267	41.1	587	49.2
Assessment of Practice	31	3.12	38	3.40	47	2.50	37	5.7	40	3.4
Total	995		1119		1881		650		1194	

Table Seven:

Number of standard exams (EXSTD) in the main Assessment Period

Source: MAB records in SITS

	2012/3	2013/4	2014/5	Provisional figures for 15/6
Year 0	0	8	8	6
Year 1	102	88	90	86
Year 2		211	195	187

3.7 Reassessment

Table Eight: Number of reassessed modules

Level of Student	2012/3	2013/4	2014/5
Year 0	13	20	25
Year 1	178	193	199
Year 2	214	237	253

Table Nine: Number of reassessed students in total

Level of Student	2012/3	2013/4	2014/5
Year 0	17	19	38
Year 1	248	311	275
Year 2	178	209	539

Table Ten: Number of reassessment items in total (no. of students x no. of individual reassessment items)

Level of Student	2012/3	2013/4	2014/5
Year 0	44	109	136
Year 1	505	870	909
Year 2	505	667	1220

Notes on the reassessment data:

1. *This summary was produced from SITS SRA (Student Reassessment) records for Undergraduate and Integrated Masters degree course students who had been referred to reassessment (Current Attempt = 2)*
2. *All courses are included for the level of the student reported, including Nursing, midwifery and ODP students, visiting students, credit-only and certificate students.*

4. Discussion

Concessions

There were a number of 'blanket' concessions granted for groups of students, covering mode of reassessment (synoptic rather than all individual items), credit value of modules for PSRB, deviation from the agreed progression requirements (AMA and LAW), and these should be considered in any review of the regulations in subsequent years.

In addition, there are a number of concessions for individual students, approved due to the particular circumstances of the student, and these are not precedents and are unlikely to be considered in any review of the regulations.

Progression

For Year One (Stage One) students, the percentage of students progressing within UEA has increased year-on-year since 2012/3. The percentage of students withdrawing/failing has decreased since 2013/4. There is a significant increase in the number of students who are repeating the year, intercalating, or waiting for a delayed sit. The percentage of students referred to reassessment in 2014/5 is similar to that in 2013/4, with a slightly smaller percentage progressing after reassessment for 2014/5. The number of students transferring within UEA is high in 2014/5 (176 students); this is a mixture of students requiring to be transferred from one UEA course to another because they did not meet the progression requirements on their original course, and students transferring from the end of Stage One (second year) of Foundation year courses, particularly in HUM, onto standard 3-year courses.

2014/5 was the first year of BIM at Year Two/Stage Two. The percentage of students progressing is higher in 2014/5 than in 2013/4, but, as would be expected, a significantly higher number were referred to reassessment. Again, like Year 1, there has been an increase in the number of students permitted to repeat the year.

Change to Rounding of Marks

With the introduction of the rounding of marks, where a mark within 0.5% of a pass would be considered a pass, 50 students passed a module with a mark between 39.5 and 39.99.

Students with a mark of less than 20% at first attempt are not referred to reassessment automatically

The new regulations permit Boards of Examiners to recommend to their Head of School that students (Stage Two upwards) who have achieved less than 20% for a module should be excluded from going to reassessment (and therefore would be withdrawn from the University). A late amendment to the draft regulations reinstated the automatic right to reassessment for students at Stage One.

91 students failed a module with a mark of less than 20% in 2014/5 and none of these students successfully progressed to their next year of study. There was a similar picture in 2013/4. Of the 58 Stage Two students in this category, as far as I can tell, only 5 students were not permitted to go to reassessment under this regulation. Many of these students are repeating the year, some are intercalating to sit delayed assessment next summer, or to take time out from their studies. It suggests that Boards of Examiners should not refer such students to reassessment, but consider their circumstances and make the decision either to repeat the year or withdraw (depending on the Extenuating Circumstances Panel's recommendation) at the time of the June exam boards.

Changes to Assessment Strategies

For Level 4 modules, the ratio of formative to summative improved initially, with a change to 40:60 from 30:70 for 2014/5 compared to 2013/4. However, this has not improved for 2015/6.

For 2014/5, the first year of BIM at level 5, the ratio was 35:65. Again, there has been no improvement from last year to this current academic year.

Also, the reduction in the number of standard exams has been small.

Reassessment

Section 3.7 summarises the number of modules, students and individual assessment items at reassessment. As would be expected, there has been an increase in the number of students being referred to reassessment with the introduction of the new regulations, although interestingly there has been a decrease for Year 1 students in the now-second year of implementation. (The increase at Foundation level can be accounted for by the large increase in students on the HUM foundation year courses). The number of students in Year 2 referred to reassessment more than doubled in this first year of implementation. There is a corresponding increase in the number of modules reassessed, although it is not linear. The number of assessment items being reassessed has increased considerably, suggesting that where students are failing modules, they are often failing more than one summative item. (If a student fails a module, they are reassessed in each failed item).

5. Recommendations

1. LTS can provide further analysis of the data, with a breakdown of figures by Faculty and School, for Teaching Directors to discuss in their Schools and/or FLTQCs. For example, data can be provided on the details of reassessment, such as identifying those modules with a poor pass rate. Members are asked to confirm what further data would be useful, along with a timeline and arrangements for consideration.
2. Module Organisers and Course Directors to take the opportunity of Course and Module update to consider the assessment patterns for modules to address some of the issues identified above, for example by increasing the proportion of formative assessment and/or decreasing summative assessment, especially exams.
3. Module Organisers and Advisers to continue to provide students referred to reassessment with the support required to help them pass and progress to the next year.
4. Longer term, to consider those students permitted to repeat periods of study, the support they receive, and their outcomes.
5. Longer term, to reconsider the regulation regarding the automatic right to reassessment for all Stages, taking into consideration what would be in the best interests of the student.