

LTC15D165

Title: Further information on BIM reassessment 2014-5
Author: Head of Learning and Teaching Services, Caroline Sauverin
Date: 9 June 2016
Circulation: LTC – 22 June 2016
Agenda: LTC15A006
Version: Final
Status: Open

Issue

LTC considered a report in December summarising the outcomes of BIM following the second year of implementation. The Committee asked for further detail pertaining to reassessment, which is included here.

Recommendation

Members are asked to note the findings and consider the recommendations for further dissemination and consideration within Schools and further enhancements to the reports in the future.

Resource Implications

N/A

Risk Implications

N/A

Equality and Diversity

The report does not contain any recommendations that will have any equality and diversity implications; further analysis of the reassessment data could be commissioned from BIU to include more analysis of student demographics.

Timing of decisions

No decisions are required.

Further Information

Caroline Sauverin, Head of LTS

1. Introduction and Background

Previously reported

The second interim report on the implementation of the Bachelors and Integrated Masters award regulations was considered at the December 2015 meeting of LTC:

<https://portal.uea.ac.uk/documents/6207125/10945302/ltc15d048dividerh.pdf/679e3e47-4b47-466c-baee-04a451f21c2b>

This included:

1. Progression statistics for Stage One and Two students in successive academic years.
2. The number of reassessed modules at each level
3. The number of reassessed students in each stage
4. Total number of reassessments.

In addition:

The overall reassessment picture was reported to the March 2016 meeting of LTC:

<https://portal.uea.ac.uk/documents/6207125/11996949/ltc15d125+Reassessments+Undertaken+2014-15.pdf/c615dca9-aab7-49be-9e1a-cf58f1633285>

This report covered:

1. The number of exams sat at reassessment and the number of students who took them.
2. The number of separate items undertaken by students, by School, at reassessment.
3. The decisions at Reassessment Boards.

This Report

At the meeting of 2 December, further details of the impact of the new BIM regulations with regard to reassessment were requested, and are covered in this report. In particular this report seeks to give members, for Foundation Year, Stage One and Two students in 2014/5:

1. The % of students failing each module.
2. The number of students going to reassessment, by School and level.
3. The number of modules failed by students, by School and level.
4. The number of assessment items failed by students, by School and level.
5. The average number of assessments/module for students, by School and level.
6. Reassessed students' demographics, linked to type of reassessment and reassessment outcome.

Data Limitations

Due to the way reassessment is handled on Nursing Sciences courses and the course set up for MB BS, the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences is excluded from this report, as the data would be misleading. In addition, the data analysed here came from a SITS export, and only fee status was available to analyse in regard to student demographics. In some tables, the data is showing the module information aggregated at the School level (the School owning the module), and in others, the data is showing the student information based on the School of registration. Direct comparison cannot be made, as students take modules from other Schools. For example, in Table 2.1 b there is one student who has failed a NAT-owned module. However, in Table 4b, there are 6 NAT students who have failed modules – they have failed modules in other Schools (BIO, CHE and CMP in this case).

2. Results

2.1 Module Fail Rate 2014-5

The following tables show the % fail rate at each level for each School, by Faculty (excluding FMH as detailed above).

(Details of individual module fail rates are available online; please go to <https://reports.uea.ac.uk> and open 'Module Fail Rates 2014-5')

Table 2.1a SSF % Fail rate at each level in each School in 2014/5 by Module

Mod School/ level	Sum of Total students	Number referred to reassessment	Fail rate (%)
DEV			
4	482	12	2.49
5	121	5	4.13
ECO			
4	333	32	9.61
5	709	26	3.67
EDU			
4	196	15	7.65
5	101	6	5.94
LAW			
4	816	33	4.04
5	671	26	3.87
NBS			
4	1548	102	6.59
5	2335	65	2.78
PSY			
4	342	14	4.09
5	134	2	1.49
SWK			
4	45	7	15.56
5	16	1	6.25

Table 2.1b SCI % Fail rate at each level in each School in 2014/5 by Module

Faculty	SCI
---------	-----

Mod School/ level	Sum of Total students	Number referred to reassessment	Fail rate (%)
BIO			
0	212	19	8.96
4	1096	44	4.01
5	1206	46	3.81
CHE			
0	383	23	6.01
4	478	21	4.39
5	567	21	3.70
CMP			
0	232	15	6.47
4	657	84	12.79
5	866	63	7.27
ENG			
4	45	9	20.00
5	31	4	12.90
ENV			
4	855	25	2.92
5	580	22	3.79
MTH			
0	233	10	4.29
4	341	20	5.87
5	659	32	4.86
NAT			
5	11	1	9.09
PHA			
4	420	83	19.76
5	488	41	8.40

Table 2.1c HUM % Fail rate at each level in each School in 2014/5 by Module

Faculty	HUM
---------	-----

Mod School/ level	Sum of Total students	Number referred to reassessment	Fail rate (%)
AMA			
4	987	55	5.57
5	575	26	4.52
HIS			
4	470	4	0.85
5	160	4	2.50
HUM			
0	564	38	6.74
LDC			
4	1165	60	5.15
5	663	16	2.41
PPL			
4	1369	82	5.99
5	493	19	3.85

2.1 d Module fail rate summarised at Faculty level

Mod Faculty/ level	Sum of TOTAL STUDENTS	Number referred to reassessment	Fail rate (%)
HUM			
0	564	38	6.74
4	3991	201	5.04
5	1891	65	3.44
SCI			
0	1060	67	6.32
4	3892	286	7.35
5	4408	228	5.17
SSF			
4	3762	215	5.72
5	4087	131	3.21

3. Number of individual students referred to reassessment and the number of students sent to reassessment in each type of assessment for BIM modules level 0, 4 and 5.

Table 3 Note:

1. All exam types are grouped under 'Exams'; Course tests are separately reported; All other assessment types are grouped under 'CW' (can include Written Assignment, Presentation, Practical, Project etc).
2. This shows *all* students, including those in Year 3 who may have taken lower-level modules as part of their CCS course.
3. Students are counted in each assessment, so will appear in more than one column if they have reassessment in more than one item type, or appear twice in one column if they have two reassessments of the same type in one module. For example, in PSY, across modules at level 4 and 5, there are 14 individual students sent to reassessment, 13 of whom had a CW assignment and 6 of whom had an exam.

Table 3		Assess Type code (group)						
Faculty	School	Mod level	CW	CT	Exam	Total unique students	Total assignments	Av no. of assignments per reassessed module
HUM	AMA	4	24	1	4	25	29	1.16
		5	18		2	19	20	1.05
	PPL	4	30	12	7	37	49	1.32
		5	13	4	5	18	22	1.22
	LDC	4	31			31	31	1.00
		5	7			7	7	1.00
	HUM	0	14	3		14	17	1.21
		4		9		9	9	1.00
	HIS	4	2			2	2	1.00
		5	1			1	1	1.00
Total			137	29	18	157	184	1.17
SCI	CMP	0	5		7	8	12	1.50
		4	28	10	34	39	72	1.85
		5	18	10	23	32	51	1.59
	CHE	0	4	3	7	7	14	2.00
		4	8	10	10	14	28	2.00
		5	13	1	17	19	31	1.63
	BIO	0	2	1	3	3	6	2.00
		4	8	4	6	10	18	1.80
		5	9		11	13	20	1.54
	PHA	0		3	3	3	6	2.00
		4	11	24	37	43	72	1.67
		5	3	7	25	28	35	1.25
	ENV	0	2	1	2	4	5	1.25
		4	4	2	7	9	13	1.44
		5	4		5	8	9	1.13
	MTH	4	4	3	11	13	18	1.38
		5	5	1	15	17	21	1.24
	NAT	4		2	3	3	5	1.67
		5	4	1	2	4	7	1.75
	Total			132	83	227	275	442
SSF	NBS	4	33	13	29	41	75	1.83
		5	5	8	19	21	32	1.52
	ECO	4	12	16	23	26	51	1.96
		5	21	14	19	30	54	1.80
	LAW	4	9	2	18	20	29	1.45
		5	11	2	10	19	23	1.21
	PSY	4	10		5	11	15	1.36
		5	3		1	3	4	1.33
	DEV	4	8	1		8	9	1.13
		5	3	2		3	5	1.67
	EDU	4	7		6	8	13	1.63
		5	2		2	4	4	1.00
	SWK	4	5			5	5	1.00
		5	1			1	1	1.00
Total			130	57	132	199	319	1.60
Grand Total			579	219	621	1005	1419	1.41

4. Reassessment and fee status (Module levels 0,4 and 5 combined)

Table 4 a This table shows the number of students in each grouped fee status category of Home, EU and Overseas. Note that 'nulls' have been removed.

Faculty	School of st..	Fee Status (group)			Grand T..
		H	EU	O	
HUM	AMA	20	1	21	42
	LDC	34	3	1	38
	PPL	23	4	19	46
	HUM	21			21
	HIS	2		1	3
	Total		100	8	42
SCI	CMP	42	2	34	78
	CHE	37	1	2	40
	BIO	17	4	4	25
	PHA	36	8	30	74
	ENV	18		2	20
	MTH	19	1	8	28
	NAT	5	1		6
	Total		174	17	80
SSF	NBS	14	2	42	58
	ECO	20	3	31	54
	LAW	17	1	15	33
	PSY	7	1	5	13
	DEV	7	1	2	10
	EDU	12			12
	SWK	5			5
Total		82	8	95	185
Grand Total		356	33	217	606

Distinct count of SPR Code broken down by Fee Status (group) vs. Faculty and School of student. The data is filtered on Mod level and Fee Status. The Mod level filter keeps 0, 4 and 5. The Fee Status filter excludes Null, E-NHS and H-OLD. The view is filtered on Faculty, which keeps HUM, SCI and SSF.

Table 4 b This table shows the breakdown of type of reassessment for each fee status group:

Faculty	School of st..	Fee Status (..	Assess Type code (group)			Grand T..	
			CW	CT	Exam		
HUM	AMA	H	19		6	20	
		EU	1			1	
		O	20	1		21	
	LDC	H	34			34	
		EU	3			3	
		O	1			1	
	PPL	H	15	10	5	23	
		EU	4		2	4	
		O	17	4	4	19	
	HUM	H	14	12		21	
	HIS	H	2			2	
		O	1			1	
	Total			131	27	17	150
	Grand Total			131	27	17	150

Distinct count of SPR Code broken down by Assess Type code (group) vs. Faculty, School of student and Fee Status (group). The data is filtered on Mod level and Fee Status. The Mod level filter keeps 0, 4 and 5. The Fee Status filter excludes Null, E-NHS and H-OLD. The view is filtered on Faculty, which keeps HUM.

Table 4b Contd.

Faculty	School of st..	Fee Status (..	Assess Type code (group)			Grand T..	
			CW	CT	Exam		
SCI	CMP	H	27	11	35	42	
		EU	1	1	2	2	
		O	22	7	26	34	
	CHE	H	23	14	31	37	
		EU	1		1	1	
		O	1		2	2	
	BIO	H	13	2	13	17	
		EU	2	2	3	4	
		O	4	1	3	4	
	PHA	H	4	17	31	36	
		EU	1	4	8	8	
		O	9	13	26	30	
	ENV	H	9	3	11	18	
		O	1		2	2	
	MTH	H	7	2	16	19	
		EU			1	1	
		O	2	2	8	8	
	NAT	H	3	2	4	5	
		EU	1	1		1	
	Total			131	82	223	271
SSF	NBS	H	10	7	11	14	
		EU	1	1	1	2	
		O	24	11	34	42	
	ECO	H	12	10	16	20	
		EU	1	3	3	3	
		O	19	15	21	31	
	LAW	H	8	3	12	17	
		EU	1		1	1	
		O	11	1	9	15	
	PSY	H	6		4	7	
		EU	1		1	1	
		O	5		1	5	
	DEV	H	7	3		7	
		EU	1			1	
		O	2			2	
	EDU	H	9		8	12	
	SWK	H	5			5	
	Total			123	54	122	185
	Grand Total			254	136	345	456

Distinct count of SPR Code broken down by Assess Type code (group) vs. Faculty, School of student and Fee Status (group). The data is filtered on Mod level and Fee Status. The Mod level filter keeps 0, 4 and 5. The Fee Status filter excludes Null, E-NHS and H-OLD. The view is filtered on Faculty, which keeps SCI and SSF.

Table 4 c Breakdown of fee status of student and coursework type, by School of Student: Number of students

Faculty	School of st..	Assess Type code (group) / Fee Status (group)												Grand Total	
		CW				CT				Exam					
		H	EU	O	Total	H	EU	O	Total	H	EU	O	Total		
HUM	AMA	19	1	20	40			1	1	6			6	42	
	LDC	34	3	1	38									38	
	PPL	15	4	17	36	10		4	14	5	2	4	11	46	
	HUM	14			14	12				12					21
	HIS	2		1	3										3
	Total		84	8	39	131	22		5	27	11	2	4	17	150
SCI	CMP	27	1	22	50	11	1	7	19	35	2	26	63	78	
	CHE	23	1	1	25	14			14	31	1	2	34	40	
	BIO	13	2	4	19	2	2	1	5	13	3	3	19	25	
	PHA	4	1	9	14	17	4	13	34	31	8	26	65	74	
	ENV	9		1	10	3			3	11		2	13	20	
	MTH	7		2	9	2		2	4	16	1	8	25	28	
	NAT	3	1		4	2	1		3	4			4	6	
	Total		86	6	39	131	51	8	23	82	141	15	67	223	271
SSF	NBS	10	1	24	35	7	1	11	19	11	1	34	46	58	
	ECO	12	1	19	32	10	3	15	28	16	3	21	40	54	
	LAW	8	1	11	20	3		1	4	12	1	9	22	33	
	PSY	6	1	5	12					4	1	1	6	13	
	DEV	7	1	2	10	3			3					10	
	EDU	9			9					8			8	12	
	SWK	5			5									5	
	Total		57	5	61	123	23	4	27	54	51	6	65	122	185
Grand Total		227	19	139	385	96	12	55	163	203	23	136	362	606	

Distinct count of SPR Code broken down by Assess Type code (group) and Fee Status (group) vs. Faculty and School of student. The data is filtered on Mod level and Fee Status. The Mod level filter keeps 0, 4 and 5. The Fee Status filter excludes Null, E-NHS and H-OLD. The view is filtered on Faculty, which keeps HUM, SCI and SSF.

Table 4 d Breakdown of fee status of student and coursework type, by School of Student: % of students

		Assess Type code (group) / Fee Status (group)																
Faculty	School of st..	CW				Total	CT				Total	Exam			Total	Grand Total		
		H	EU	O			H	EU	O			H	EU	O				
HUM	AMA	47.50%	2.50%	50.00%	100.00%				100.00%	100.00%	100.00%				100.00%	100.00%		
	LDC	89.47%	7.89%	2.63%	100.00%											100.00%		
	PPL	41.67%	11.11%	47.22%	100.00%	71.43%		28.57%	100.00%	45.45%	18.18%	36.36%	100.00%			100.00%	100.00%	
	HUM	100.00%			100.00%	100.00%			100.00%								100.00%	
	HIS	66.67%		33.33%	100.00%												100.00%	
	Total		64.12%	6.11%	29.77%	100.00%	81.48%		18.52%	100.00%	64.71%	11.76%	23.53%	100.00%			100.00%	100.00%
SCI	CMP	54.00%	2.00%	44.00%	100.00%	57.89%	5.26%	36.84%	100.00%	55.56%	3.17%	41.27%	100.00%			100.00%	100.00%	
	CHE	92.00%	4.00%	4.00%	100.00%	100.00%			100.00%	91.18%	2.94%	5.88%	100.00%			100.00%	100.00%	
	BIO	68.42%	10.53%	21.05%	100.00%	40.00%	40.00%	20.00%	100.00%	68.42%	15.79%	15.79%	100.00%			100.00%	100.00%	
	PHA	28.57%	7.14%	64.29%	100.00%	50.00%	11.76%	38.24%	100.00%	47.69%	12.31%	40.00%	100.00%			100.00%	100.00%	
	ENV	90.00%		10.00%	100.00%	100.00%			100.00%	84.62%		15.38%	100.00%			100.00%	100.00%	
	MTH	77.78%		22.22%	100.00%	50.00%		50.00%	100.00%	64.00%	4.00%	32.00%	100.00%			100.00%	100.00%	
	NAT	75.00%	25.00%		100.00%	66.67%	33.33%		100.00%	100.00%				100.00%			100.00%	100.00%
	Total		65.65%	4.58%	29.77%	100.00%	62.20%	9.76%	28.05%	100.00%	63.23%	6.73%	30.04%	100.00%			100.00%	100.00%
SSF	NBS	28.57%	2.86%	68.57%	100.00%	36.84%	5.26%	57.89%	100.00%	23.91%	2.17%	73.91%	100.00%			100.00%	100.00%	
	ECO	37.50%	3.13%	59.38%	100.00%	35.71%	10.71%	53.57%	100.00%	40.00%	7.50%	52.50%	100.00%			100.00%	100.00%	
	LAW	40.00%	5.00%	55.00%	100.00%	75.00%		25.00%	100.00%	54.55%	4.55%	40.91%	100.00%			100.00%	100.00%	
	PSY	50.00%	8.33%	41.67%	100.00%					66.67%	16.67%	16.67%	100.00%			100.00%	100.00%	
	DEV	70.00%	10.00%	20.00%	100.00%	100.00%			100.00%							100.00%	100.00%	
	EDU	100.00%			100.00%					100.00%				100.00%			100.00%	100.00%
	SWK	100.00%			100.00%												100.00%	100.00%
	Total		46.34%	4.07%	49.59%	100.00%	42.59%	7.41%	50.00%	100.00%	41.80%	4.92%	53.28%	100.00%			100.00%	100.00%
Grand Total		58.96%	4.94%	36.10%	100.00%	58.90%	7.36%	33.74%	100.00%	56.08%	6.35%	37.57%	100.00%			100.00%	100.00%	

% of Total Distinct count of SPR Code broken down by Assess Type code (group) and Fee Status (group) vs. Faculty and School of student. The data is filtered on Mod level and Fee Status. The Mod level filter keeps 0, 4 and 5. The Fee Status filter excludes Null, E-NHS and H-OLD. The view is filtered on Faculty, which keeps HUM, SCI and SSF. Percents are based on each row of each pane of the table.

5. Pass rate at reassessment

Following on from the above tables showing % fail rate at first sit, the tables below show the % pass/fail at reassessment, categorised by the Schools delivering the modules.

Table 5 Pass rate in modules at reassessment (Level 0, 4 and 5): HUM

Agreed grade (group)			
School	Mod level	Pass at reassessment	Fail at reassessment
AMA	2		100.00%
	3	27.27%	72.73%
	4	48.15%	51.85%
	5	54.17%	45.83%
HIS	3		100.00%
	4	75.00%	25.00%
	5	66.67%	33.33%
HUM	0	44.12%	55.88%
LDC	3	33.33%	66.67%
	4	51.67%	48.33%
	5	31.25%	68.75%
PPL	3	14.29%	85.71%
	4	63.75%	36.25%
	5	47.06%	52.94%

% of Total Number of Records broken down by Agreed grade (group) vs. School and Mod level. The data is filtered on Faculty, Completed number, Current Attempt and Agreed grade. The Faculty filter keeps HUM. The Completed number filter keeps 2. The Current Attempt filter keeps 1, 2 and 3. The Agreed grade filter keeps 16 of 17 members. The view is filtered on School, which keeps 24 of 24 members. Percents are based on each column of each pane

Table 5 Pass rate in modules at reassessment (Level 0, 4 and 5): SSF

School	Mod level	Agreed grade (group)		
		Pass at reassessment	Fail at reassessment	Delayed reassessment
DEV	4	81.82%	18.18%	
	5	80.00%	20.00%	
ECO	3	11.76%	76.47%	11.76%
	4	72.41%	17.24%	10.34%
	5	73.08%	19.23%	7.69%
EDU	3		100.00%	
	4	100.00%		
	5	60.00%	20.00%	20.00%
LAW	3	41.67%	58.33%	
	4	67.74%	29.03%	3.23%
	5	48.00%	52.00%	
NBS	3	56.52%	43.48%	
	4	76.29%	22.68%	1.03%
	5	61.67%	28.33%	10.00%
PSY	3		100.00%	
	4	64.29%	35.71%	
	5	50.00%	50.00%	
SWK	4	85.71%		14.29%
	5	100.00%		

Table 5 Pass rate in modules at reassessment (Level 0, 4 and 5): SCI

School	Mod level	Agreed grade (group)		
		Pass at reassessment	Fail at reassessment	Delayed reassessment
BIO	0	29.41%	58.82%	11.76%
	3		100.00%	
	4	58.33%	27.78%	13.89%
	5	55.26%	42.11%	2.63%
CHE	0	40.00%	60.00%	
	3	42.86%	57.14%	
	4	42.86%	52.38%	4.76%
	5	72.22%	11.11%	16.67%
	M		100.00%	
CMP	0	53.33%	40.00%	6.67%
	3	55.56%	44.44%	
	4	41.33%	57.33%	1.33%
	5	71.93%	26.32%	1.75%
ENG	4	57.14%	42.86%	
	5	100.00%		
ENV	3		100.00%	
	4	45.45%	54.55%	
	5	52.94%	35.29%	11.76%
MTH	0	30.00%	70.00%	
	3	41.67%	41.67%	16.67%
	4	65.00%	30.00%	5.00%
	5	44.83%	41.38%	13.79%
NAT	5		100.00%	
PHA	3	81.48%	7.41%	11.11%
	4	70.69%	20.69%	8.62%
	5	67.86%	25.00%	7.14%

6. Discussion

Table 2 gives an overview of the failure rate at first sit for BIM students at Module level in each School, by Faculty. For the majority of Schools, the failure rate was greater for students in their first year, as they settled down; in addition, those students not passing reassessment would be withdrawn, or have obtained a concession, such as repeating the year. Over 10% of the cohort failed at first attempt at Level 4 in SWK, CMP, ENG and PHA, and this was repeated at level 5 for ENG. These percentages need to be considered in the context of the total numbers on the cohort, which is small in ENB and SWK. Although the reported % fail rates are summarised here at School level, further details at module level are available on the Tableau server; please go to <https://reports.uea.ac.uk> and open 'Module Fail Rates 2014-5' and the data summarised at module level masks some quite high individual module fail rates.

Table 3 summarises the number of assessments and the number of individual students at reassessment. The final column shows that the average number of assignments being reassessed by students per module is between 1 and 2. In general, SCI Schools, along with NBS and ECO, have greater averages, over 1.5 items per module, whilst HUM and the rest of SSF tend to have nearer just one item per module. It also should be borne in mind that students are sent to reassessment in each item they have failed in, but keep the marks of any items they passed. In this way, they are able to pass the module without necessarily passing each or indeed any reassessment item (as long as they improve their mark so that overall they pass the module), due to the in-module compensation. Colleagues will recall that this method of reassessment (as opposed to replacing all marks obtained with one synoptic reassessment mark) has been shown to benefit the less-able student, giving them a greater chance of passing the module. Of course, for those modules where there is only one summative piece of assessment, reassessment will work in the same way as synoptic reassessment, as marks are capped at the pass mark. Although there were concerns raised by both academic colleagues and students regarding the increase in the number of reassessed items, the table shows that this increase is not as great as perhaps was feared and is localised to some Schools (and could be designed out further, with a review of assessment strategies in those modules where it is prevalent).

Table 4 gives some detail comparing Home/EU and Overseas status and referral to reassessment. A proper statistical comparison of the subgroup of students with the main cohorts would need to be carried out before committing to any conclusion but it looks like fee status does not have a significant effect on type of assessment failed nor the number of fails. It highlights the need to ensure that all students are appropriately supported.

Following on from the earlier tables which show % failure at first sit, Table 5 gives the % rate of pass/fail in the reassessed modules at each level.

7. Conclusion

This sort of information has not been available to Schools in this sort of format before. With the adoption of Tableau as our corporate reporting tool, information like this could be made available on a regular basis to help Schools consider their Learning and Teaching strategies and how their assessment strategies are working in practice.

8. Recommendations

1. Disseminate this information to Schools, through the publishing of these reports on the UEA reports server.
2. Commission BIU, with Head of LTS (Systems), to develop these reports further, with direct access to SITS data via the Warehouse, to ensure a more sustainable, robust set of reports in the future.
3. Similarly, commission further reports to analyse students' outcomes based on their demographics to help inform Schools' assessment strategies.
4. Repeat the analyses covered above in future BIM reports to LTC.