

LTC14D078

**Title:** Reassessment under the new Bachelors and Integrated Masters Regulations: consideration of reassessment events for 2014-5 onwards  
**Author:** Caroline Sauverin, Head LTS (Systems)  
**Circulation:** LTC - 3 December 2014  
**Agenda:** LTC14A002  
**Version:** Final  
**Status:** Open

---

## OPEN

### Issue

To report on consideration of the arrangements for reassessment in the second year of the Bachelors and Integrated Masters (BIM) Regulations, following a concession last year to combine course tests and exams where the learning outcomes were the same.

### Recommendation

There is no recommendation in this report. Recipients are asked to note that there is no recommendation to continue with the concession granted for last academic year; Reassessment in any failed module will be in all failed items, as stipulated in the BIM regulations.

### Resource Implications

N/a

### Risk Implications

N/a

### Equality and Diversity

N/a

### Timing of decisions

Although there is no action required of LTC, this will be a timely reminder to Module Organisers to take into consideration during the current module update for 2015/6 delivery.

### Further Information

Contact: Caroline Sauverin, [c.sauverin@uea.ac.uk](mailto:c.sauverin@uea.ac.uk)

### Background

1. One of the principles of the New Academic Model was that reassessment would be offered in each individual item failed, rather than the synoptic reassessment that was the arrangement in the CCS regulations<sup>1</sup>.
2. Arrangements for 2013-4
  - a. Last year the PVC-Academic on behalf of LTC approved the following amendment to the BIM regulations for one year only:

#### 13.1

Students eligible for reassessment will be offered a reassessment opportunity in all failed components of the failed module, normally in the form of the original assessment, **except in the \*following circumstance**. Any exceptions to this may be made only with the approval of the Learning and Teaching Committee of Senate.

---

<sup>1</sup> Modules for professional courses where there is a requirement to pass each individual item were not affected by this – these continue to be reassessed at item level, and students are required to attain the pass mark at each item level.

**\*Where a student has failed both a course test and an exam assessment item in a failed module, the reassessment will be by exam, and the mark obtained for the exam will replace both the original course test mark and the original exam mark.**

- b. The main reason for this was to ensure that all the course tests and exams could be accommodated in the reassessment period with the subsidiary benefit that students were not being assessed unnecessarily (where the learning outcomes of both the course test and exams were the same).

Although this regulation was put in place, of the 25 affected modules, only 10 reassessed by the exam only, the Module Organisers of the remaining modules choosing to continue to reassess by the planned separate course test and exam events

## Discussion

Arrangements for 2014-5 and future years

- a. Last year, TPPG was asked to consider the following for 2014/5:
  - i. (Option A) Do we do this 'combining' of course tests and exams for one year only, and revert to assessment in all items for next year, for all years, and extend the reassessment period to accommodate the extra course tests?
  - ii. (Option B) Do we do this 'combining' for just level 0 and level 1, in future, and reassess in all items for levels 2 and above?
  - iii. (Option C) Do we adopt these changes for all levels?
  - iv. (Option D) Do we review the status of course tests and either make them officially exams, albeit locally managed, or stop the use of course tests as summative assessments, only formative?
- b. The consideration at TPPG on 1 May 2014, the following was noted:
  1. 'that it was felt that option 'D' was not appropriate, though there were implications for BIM. Option 'C' was felt to be the most appropriate and pragmatic option. It was also important to maintain parity across all schools. In addition reassessment at item level did cause logistical problems, for example within SCI where labs were required for some types of assessment'.
- c. However, TPPG, at its meeting of 19 November 2014, reconsidered the arrangements for this year and beyond for the following reasons:
  - i. The reassessment period for 2014/5 is scheduled to be 11 days, rather than the 7 days that were available for 2013/4, so scheduling events should not be problematic.
  - ii. Module Organisers have had the opportunity to review their course and module assessment strategies, to eliminate the duplication of coursetests and exams that assess the same learning outcomes summatively. They are encouraged to continue with this.
  - iii. Module Organisers are encouraged to reduce the quantity of summative assessments, and in particular exams.
  - iv. Module Organisers are encouraged to find assessment methods other than exams at the end of the year for Autumn-delivered modules.
  - v. It is one of the principles of the NAM that when a module is failed, each item failed will be reassessed, normally in the original mode. This principle is still valid.
  - vi. The number of Level 5 (year 2) modules affected is very small (see attached appendix).
- d. TPPG endorsed the following actions:
  - e. Reversion to the original regulation that students be offered a reassessment opportunity in all failed components of the failed module.
  - f. Where there are sound pedagogical reasons to vary the reassessment from 'all failed components in the form of the original assessment', this will be considered as a concession by the Academic Director of Taught Programmes on behalf of LTC.
  - g. Academic staff continue to work towards assessment strategies which do not include a summative course test and exam which assess the same learning outcomes. **It is timely to be considering this now, as staff update their modules and courses for 2015/6.**