

LTC14D187

Title: First interim evaluative report following the implementation of the Bachelors and Integrated Masters award regulations
Author: Head of Learning and Teaching Services, Caroline Sauverin
Date: 5 May 2015
Circulation: LTC – 13 May 2015
Agenda: LTC14A005
Version: Final
Status: Open

Issue

As part of the implementation the New Academic model, subsequently known as the Bachelors and Integrated Masters (BIM) regulations, there was a commitment to review its implementation periodically. The report is a reflective review following the first year of implementation.

Recommendation

The report is for information, but members may wish to comment on the findings.

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. The New Academic Model (NAM) regulations, now known as the Bachelors and Integrated Masters (BIM) Regulations, came into force for students starting courses at level 4 and foundation year in 2013/4. In preparation for the new regulations, undergraduate and integrated masters courses were reviewed and modified within Schools and scrutinised by LTC members to ensure that they were aligned with the requirements of NAM. This scrutiny was overseen by and reported to LTC. The template and guidance notes are available at:

<http://www.uea.ac.uk/learningandteaching/documents/newacademicmodel>

1.2. As part of the implementation of the new regulations, it was agreed to review the implementation periodically, at least after one year, and after the first students had graduated. We are now in a position to review the first year of implementation, and a further review is scheduled to take place after 2015/6, when the first students graduate.

1.3. This review aims to assess the impact of the first year of implementation against the principles of the New Academic Model (<http://www.uea.ac.uk/learningandteaching/documents/newacademicmodel/Main+features+of+the+New+Bachelors+and+Integrated+Masters+Award+Regulations+v4+140912>)

1.4. The Academic Director of Taught Programmes has identified the framework for evaluation of the new regulations as set out below. In addition, there are a number of indicators which can be assessed one year into the regulations. It should be noted that some of the measures will not be a direct comparison with the CCS students due to other initiatives and changes to regulations which are expected to have promoted retention, reduced the number of appeals and complaints and improved employability.

1.5. Subsequent to the introduction of BIM, Senate approved a 'direction of travel' with regard to the provision of taught programmes, and these measures are also included in this report:

- fewer courses, fewer modules with low student enrolment, having the majority of assessed work formative with less summative and fewer exams;
- summative coursework items to be worth at least 10% of the overall assessment weighting for each module¹.

1.6. The content of the review, as set out in a *Review Plan* was approved by LTC at its meeting on 18 March 2015.

Extract from the Academic Director of Taught Programmes' report to LTC at its meeting on 30 January 2013:

'It will be essential for the University to ensure that the impact of the NAM is closely monitored and evaluated. It is recommended, therefore, that LTC establish an evaluative framework for assessing NAM both ahead of implementation and in first 3 years of application including a qualitative element referencing academic views and experience. This process of evaluation should include and draw-upon feedback from Course Directors, Heads of Schools, Faculty

¹ ET Away Day 11.10.13, Learning and Teaching Summit meeting of DVC, PVC, Deans and AD (L&T), Ac DTP, Director and Heads of LTS 4.11.13, Senate 6.11.13, University Policy Half Day 13.11.13, LTC 25.6.14.

LTQCs, and School SSLCs for early reactions circa 15 months in to the NAM (i.e. in January 2015) by email enquiry and via SSLC student reps. This feedback should be collated by the Learning and Teaching Service, analysed by the Academic Director of Taught Programmes and the Heads of LTS, and subsequently presented as an interim evaluative report, to LTC at the end of the spring semester 2015 (April 2015). The report should conform to an explicit framework which includes information on:

- *appeals*
- *complaints*
- *drop-out*
- *reassessment data*
- *NSS scores*
- *classification outcomes*
- *OIA judgements*
- *employability impacts.*

This should be followed by a summative evaluation after five years (completed in Sept 2018). Our approach should be intended to capture any unintended consequences as well as the outcomes we would be expecting to assess as part of our evaluation.

Recommendations:

- 1) Interim evaluative report produced by ADTP/LTS (Jan 2015).*
- 2) Summative evaluation produced after five years (Sep 2018)'.²*

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 year².
3. Change to assessment strategies
 - The proportion of assessment which is formative compared to summative;
 - The number of exams;
 - The total number of assessments.
4. Issues raised by colleagues in implementing the new regulations

² 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.

- LTS Managers and Coordinators captured regulatory and operational concerns associated with the first year of running the new regulations that were identified by academic and administrative colleagues during the year.
 - Faculty Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees were invited to submit comments from their Schools on how the first year of implementation went, in particular the benefits and challenges of the implementation, such as increased formative work, reassessment in every item and students requiring to pass every module.
5. Appeals and complaints and any OIA cases for BIM students.
- 2.2. Exclusions from the first 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 year of BIM regulations)

3. Compliance and performance against the key principles of the New Academic Model in addition to the above.

1. Each BA/BSc (Hons) degree comprises of at least 360 credits, with at least 90 credits at level 6 and no more than 20 credits at level 4 in stage 2.
2. Each Integrated Masters degree comprises of at least 480 credits, with no more than 20 credits at module level 4 in stage 2, at least 90 credits at level 6 in stage 3 and 120 credits at level 7 in stage 4.
3. Modules will follow a clear progression from levels 4, to 5 to 6 to & 7, which aligns with the Higher Education credit framework for England.
4. All courses have Programme-level outcomes and the ways these are to be assessed should be clear for all.
5. The Higher Education credit framework for England level descriptors have been adopted.
6. Assessment and classification rules have been simplified, with the use of algorithms.
7. Simplification of the rules for classification to include a reduction in the discretion available to Boards of Examiners. Algorithms approved and included in 2013/14 regulations.
8. Year weightings for all UEA 3 and 4 year Honours degrees are 40:60, stage 2: final stage. Year weightings for all Integrated Masters degrees are 20:30:50, stage 2: stage 3: stage 4. Findings: These year weightings have been programmed into the SITS classification rules.

4. Results

4.1. Concessions granted against the regulations

The concessions against the regulations granted by the Academic Director of Taught Programmes have been collated.

TABLE ONE: BIM-Related concession requests (up to 20 February 2015)

Source: M Pavey, LTS Manager

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)

Temporary change to the Regulations in regard to reassessment in each failed item

- a. 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
- b. For 2013/4, the PVC-Academic approved a temporary change to the regulations:

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.

***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.**

- c. 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 combining the course test and exam into one item of assessment ie the exam only; the Module Organisers of the remaining modules choosing to continue to reassess by the planned separate course test and exam events. LTC confirmed that this temporary change to the regulation would not continue beyond 2013/4 at its meeting of 3 December 2014: <https://portal.uea.ac.uk/documents/6207125/7848102/ltc14d078.pdf/f815772f-4e5f-4d1d-a11c-cd2b61c2c6f6>

4.2. Progression outcomes for Stage One students

Table Two Progression Statistics for Stage One Students 2012/3 and 2013/4

Source: SPI SITS codes, analysed by Planning Office

Summary	2012/3		2013/4	
	Number	% of total	Number	% of total
Students progressing on course	2480	89.1	2468	86.8
Students not continuing at UEA	257	9.2	290	10.2
Others (transfers within UEA, repeat, intercalation)	45	1.6	85	3.0
Total	2782		2843	

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

Notes on the progression outcomes data:

1. This summary was produced from SITS SPI (Student Progression Information) records for Undergraduate and Integrated Masters degree course students studying in their first year, Stage One.
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.

4.3. 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 THREE: Details of students who passed a module with a mark between 39.50 and 39.99% (Source: SITS SMR records for 2013/4)

Level	Number of Students	Comments
Foundation Year	2	
Stage One	30	19 students progressed with no reassessment. 11 students were reassessed in other modules, 9 of whom progressed to the next year. One failed, and one is intercalating.

4.4. The number of students who had a mark of less than 20% at first attempt and their final outcome for the year.

TABLE FOUR:

Number of students receiving a mark of below 20% at first attempt and their final outcome

Level	Academic Fail	Intercalating	Repeat	Transfer	Total
0	15	2			17
1	44	3	5	1	53
Grand Total	59	5	5	1	70

In addition, the Assessments and Quality Office reported 'facts and figures' on reassessment to LTC at its meeting of 3 December 2014; (note, this covers all years, not just Foundation Year/Stage One).

<https://portal.uea.ac.uk/documents/6207125/7848102/ltc14d088.pdf/59eea479-ffd2-4023-b415-5c69e219c79e>

4.5. Changes to assessment strategies

Table 5 Analysis of Assessment Types for Level 4 in 2013/4

(Note: this information is not available for 2012/3, but will be available for future years for comparisons). Source: 2013/4 MAB data from SITS

Table Five	count	%
Formative	287	28.8
Course Test	163	16.4
Exam - standard	88	8.8
Exam - other	8	0.8
Written Assignment	285	28.6
Project	25	2.5

Practical	43	4.3
Presentation	50	5.0
OSCE	15	1.5
Assessment of Practice	31	3.1
Total	995	

Table 6
Number of exams in Assessment Period
Source: LTS Exams data spreadsheets

	2012/3	2013/4
Year 0	0	8
Year 1	102	88

4.6. **Issues raised by colleagues (Chairs of Boards of Examiners, secretaries to Exam Boards, Teaching Directors)** are logged in the attached **Table 7**.

4.7. **Feedback from FLTQCs:**

1. **FMH**

‘All in all the new regulations have been very successful, and we very much welcome the emphasis being placed at course / programme level. The emphasis also on the reduction of modules with small numbers extremely useful to us in FMH (where we have a number of modules that would fall into this category); however, the big obstacle to us in achieving this is the paucity of accurate information regarding enrolments to these modules’. (From secretary to the FLTQC, Alex Hupton, 27-4-15).

2. **SSF** BIM Interim Report from SSF

Ratula Chakraborty (AD L&TQ)

It was felt by the Teaching Directors of all SSF schools that a more appropriate time to review the effectiveness of the BIM would be after the exam boards where certain statistics would be possible to extract.

Progression outcomes compared to previous years: We have received statistics from ECO on how changes in regulations have affected progression. ECO have lost as a direct result of the new regs17/174(a fail rate of 9.8%) of first year students at the end of 13/14. This compares with 12/181 (6.6%) in 2012/13 – a rise of 3.2 percentage points (an increase of 48%). It is possible that at the end of 2014/15 we will see evidence of fails which might potentially require second year students to withdraw.

Ratio 1:1 Formative: Summative: There are a variety of formative assessment methods used by schools in SSF. In LAW it is felt that a strict 1:1 requirement (assuming ongoing oral feedback does not count) would deter colleagues from trying any innovative methods. However LAW has for some time, had the standard practice of each module having formative assessment, so there has not been an increase here as most modules also only have one piece of summative assessment. There is a feeling in PSY that if there is any intention of being directed towards specific forms of formative assessment it should be made clear. Otherwise it will be useful to suggest that modules should include formative elements and that the number and ratio can be irrelevant as it is the impact on the summative assessment and the impact on learning - which is key.

The SSF Faculty Convenor has raised concerns where this issue has been discussed at LTQCs about student workload and his thoughts were in line with some Teaching Directors. Indeed on this matter NBS reported that some research in the school revealed that formative assessment was more helpful at stage 1 but by stage 3 the students feel that they should be focusing their time on summative work.

It is felt in ECO that it is not always in the best interests of students to meet the recommendation of a 1:1 ratio between summative and formative assessment and this is largely a view held by most schools in SSF.

Reducing the assessment load:

PSY makes a point about the reduction of coursework which is quite a complex issue. PSY has worked hard to meet institutional expectations of reducing assessment – however this can run counter to student wishes. PSY typically have 100% assignments in 20 credit modules (with of course many formative elements). Some students have indicated that they would prefer two assessment attempts – this is especially the case when students achieve grades around the high 2.2 boundary. Indeed having two pieces of coursework could work for the institutional targets of ‘good degrees’ if for example, those graded at say 58% in the first assessment manage a 62%+ in their second. In certain other schools in SSF though – there are more than one assessment per module and therefore a greater chance for students to accrue marks and improving their degree classification which at the end helps the university in ‘good honours’.

The new BIM framework encourages the reduction of the total number of exams and this could provide opportunities for semesterisation. Colloquially semesterisation is a short fat module over one semester as opposed to a long-thin module over the course of a year. By adopting semesterisation, it could open up opportunities for further internationalisation of the curriculum via semester ERASMUS exchanges. Given the reluctance for the university to move towards January examination at UG level, this will need to be carefully thought through as courses with industry accreditations often stipulate exam based assessment in order to qualify for post graduate professional study exemptions.

Re-assessment: Due to the requirement of students to be re-assessed in all failed components and that now BIM covers first and second year students there is an increase in the workload for academic staff. This also has consequences for students as they can potentially be in a situation of submitting several pieces of assessment in a short period of time. Also the lack of concession to replace a course test and exam re-assessment with just an exam adds to such problems. It is not a win-win situation and quite possibly the reverse.

Students with under 20% do not have a right to re-assessment under BIM. The importance of this change should be reviewed once the exam boards have been held.

Defined choice: Initially there was some concept that Schools would liaise and provide specific 'defined' choices for students outside of their Schools. In PSY it is felt that the reality is that we have not really moved on from pre-BIM times apart from indicating to students what out of School modules may be preferred. It would be useful if the issue of defined choice was reviewed further to see if we can encourage greater interdisciplinary exploration in ways which are less 'risky' and more simply managed than at present. The whole process is also time consuming for both academic and LTS colleagues.

3. HUM

No comments received

4. SCI – comments from individual Schools as follows:

BIO – Mark Coleman, Director of Teaching and Learning

I would like to have had more time for this and to consult with colleagues more widely but unfortunately we (as DLTs) were asked for this information at Thursday lunchtime with a deadline of 9 am on Tuesday morning, after a bank holiday weekend. I sent an email to colleagues immediately on Thursday but have only received one response. This is included below but the rest is my comments, which to an extent reflect conversations I've had with colleagues, especially since becoming DLT on 1 August last year, but they don't reflect the wider consultation that I think would have been more useful. Unfortunately it has not been possible for me to speak to Helen James about this in any detail since Thursday. As DLT before me and at the time that BIM was introduced, her views would have been very valuable.

Reassessment at the item level

This a major concern related to BIM, one that I have expressed previously to Ben Milner.

There is an extreme but possible scenario where a student could be faced with an entire academic year's worth of coursework and exams in a quite short period of time. Last year (for Level 4) the BIO students undertaking reassessment coursework could access their reassessment tasks via the LTS Blackboard site from 18 July and were expected to submit their work by 18 August. Reassessment exams were then scheduled in the following week. Thus some students were faced with a large volume of coursework combined with having to revise for reassessment exams in a very compressed period of time.

I think we should look at the possibility of extending the time between when reassessment coursework is made available and when it is submitted and ensure a period of at least two weeks between the submission date and the first exam (for students to concentrate on revision). It is also critical that exams are as spread out as possible, and at the very least no student has two exams on the same day. I realize that this would be challenging but I am very concerned about student stress levels resulting from this intense assessment period.

Increasing engagement

It is difficult to be precise about the extent of the effect the increased monitoring of attendance has had in 2014-15, not least because the change introduced, increased use of registers, generates the data by which this can be quantitatively judged. It does appear that it may have increased attendance in the first semester, but our Engagement Officer (EO), appointed for this purpose, comments that this appears to have not been carried forward in the Spring Semester. We need to compare the semesters quantitatively but if this turns out to be true it may be a consequence of problems we experienced in implementing the system, in particular in analysing the data supplied by the Hub and setting up meetings with the EO. We hope we have now solved this with help from local support. Our EO comments that she wishes that she had been able to get this up and running earlier as she believes it is a valuable way of identifying student problems early.

A further problem has been the rather variable engagement of colleagues in register taking.

Course structure

We have combined four Level 4 10-credit modules in pairs to make two 20-credit modules. If we were to split these up again we could increase student choice and offer modules better suited to the students' A Level choices. We are currently reviewing Level 4 teaching.

Formative assessment

It would have been excellent if we could have consulted more widely on this and conducted a thorough analysis. Based on anecdotal evidence I think this what we would have found had we been able to do so:

- 1) The level of student engagement with formative work has been very variable, often with less than 20% of students engaging with a particular piece of work;
- 2) For students that do engage the formative work and feedback on it has been valuable.

This is a tricky one to solve. In a sense it would be much easier the students who did the formative work thought it was worthless – if that were so we could simply try to think of alternative work. At the moment I think we have work that is valuable but still many students don't engage. We will need to work on how to improve participation and embed this in the learning culture.

Comments from a colleague

Dear Mark

Two things from me reflecting on last year

Students referred to reassessment and/or taking delayed first sits were not appropriately informed of the outcomes of subsequent Exam Board meetings. i.e., 1 or 2 days before start of semester 2 students found they were unable to login in to UEA IT resources. Subsequent enquiries by the students via their advisor or friendly available faculty member established that these students were not allowed to progress to the next year of study. A very upsetting situation for all concerned and a terrible way to find out this information. Decisions need to be conveyed much more swiftly from Exam Board meetings to students – ex communication a hrs before the start of semester was appalling.

Formative coursework is submitted via the HUB, who collate that information in a spreadsheet and provide it to MO when the work is collected for marking. So why do the MOs then have to provide the HUB with a spreadsheet to indicate who submitted formative coursework?

CHE – Dr Nigel Clayden

Implementation of the BIM courses went extremely well in the first year. The required documentation was completed in time and no problems were encountered during the delivery of the first year of BIM.

As a School we raised concerns from the outset about the BIM changes being introduced, in particular, the implied administrative burden and the effect on the student experience. The original proposals did not embrace SMART objectives since engagement was used in a qualitative sense and no target was established for how improved engagement would be picked up in metrics such as retention and Good Honours. Moreover, given the continuing improvements in these metrics driven by the Faculties it is unclear how we will establish any additional benefit. Nevertheless, there has been one clear benefit which has been to review what we are doing and to refocus teaching activities. Set against this, the rapid implementation gave very little time to build a consensus around anything other than making minimal changes to the courses. Consequently we have not seen any benefit which might have been possible with a more radical approach to altering the course structures. Thus CHE is concerned we will only see marginal changes brought about by an unnecessary cost in administrative effort. We will only be able to establish whether the new courses have promoted improved engagement in terms of learning outcomes after monitoring the courses for a few years. Preliminary evidence, however, does not suggest any improvement since essentially no difference was seen in the module averages for core chemistry modules between the last year of the CCS in 2012/13 and the first year of BIM 2013/14. Initial evidence is that engagement, as measured by attendance at teaching events, also has not improved.

CHE was supportive from the first about the reduction in the number of summative assessments having already reduced the number of these before BIM was introduced. We also supported the switch to more formative assessments. However, our experience to date is that we have been unable to convince students of the merit of fully engaging with these. Moreover, the idea of formative assessments has led them to be seen not so much as a preparation for learning as a preparation for summative assessments. They do not guide the future delivery of material because there is no free time in the modules. Besides which with exam questions written in semester 1 there is no option to change semester 2 teaching. In addition, formative assessments are becoming too process driven and formalised, for example monitoring of the completion of formative assessments. Whilst we fully support the reduction in the assessment period to four weeks we are concerned that future possible reductions in examinations will make gaining RSC accreditation much harder and will introduce a new complexity namely providing external examiners oversight of this coursework element. Chemistry, like other pure hard disciplines, are examination oriented in their assessments. CHE is also worried about the impact of the reassessment in every failed item on the potential workload for a student sent to reassessment or given delayed assessments in the autumn. They may have the equivalent of 6 months assessment in just one month. As these may already be weaker students we are, potentially, setting them up to fail again.

The challenges CHE faces as we complete the implementation of BIM are threefold. Encouraging students to engage with formative work, providing specialisation for IM students in level 7 modules because of small cohorts and accommodating any changes in the number of examinations.

CMP - From Chairman of UG examiners (CMP)

As chairman of examiners this is my (only partly subjective) feedback. BIM did not turn out to be as bad as we expected for the first years. The ability to reassess each unit of assessment actually makes reassessment easier, because they can retain the marks they have already achieved and often can fail the reassessment but pass the module.

For example, suppose a module has a coursework and exam, 50/50 each. Student achieves 50% on the coursework but only gets 20% on the exam, hence fails with overall 35%. Previously, they would have to resit the exam and get 40%. Now, because they retain the 50%, they could fail the exam resit with 30% but pass the module over all.

The ones most at risk are those on joint programmes like BIS. Often they are very bad at one module, such as programming. Previously, they could have failed it but got through overall. They are no longer able to do so. There were several students averaging 2.2 who had to reassess. This is, in my mind, a good thing. However, it can seem very harsh. I talked to one ACT SCI student who was averaging 70% in everything but programming. It was of no interest to him and would not be used in the rest of his degree or in his career as an actuary. Yet if he fails, he is out. Harsh, but to me, fair. I just told him to knuckle down and study.

I am more nervous about this year's year 2 students. In previous years, up to 30%-40% have failed programming 2 or data structures and algorithms or both. They will now have to reassess, whereas previously we let them limp into year 3. This is to me also a good thing, but we run the risk of high dropout rates and there is no accommodation in the work load model for the extra work for those who have to set and mark the reassessments. I will let you know how it plays out after the examiners award board.

My feeling is that BIM means we should more actively manage modules that may have problems at the school level, because one failing module can have large ramifications.

I also think the university should expend more effort on actually explaining the regulations to the students, as they are generally ignorant of them.

Comments from other faculty

Reassessment was a bit of a shambles as the system was completely unprepared for the additional work - especially for coursework reassessments. Poor communication between LTS and students was mentioned frequently in appeals.

The "pass all modules" rule has been beneficial and students seem to be performing better.

CMP could probably make better use of the synoptic reassessment concession to reduce the number of reassessment assignments. External examiners need better access to coursework assignments as we reduce the number and value of exams. (For example, at Brighton they give EEs access to relevant modules on Blackboard, where each has an EE section, which is not available to students - EEs therefore have access to all module materials, electronic submissions and marks.)

I assume someone will compute some basic stats..

% Formative Assessments Submitted & mark profile

% Summative Assessments Submitted & mark profile

Hopefully there is a correlation.

We seem to be down on Year in Industry applications across the Science Faculty and wondered if that was BIM related?

ENV – nothing received from the Teaching Director, but SSLC response reported below.

MTH – nothing received from the Teaching Director

NAT Dr Martin Loftus

From a Natural Sciences perspective BIM has reduced choice because of the removal of 10 credit modules. Before BIM it was quite common for a Nat Sci student to add a 10 credit maths module or a 10 credit skills module to their main subject choices. Now that modules are 20+ credits, there is almost no chance of adding such a module once sensible modules in at least two subjects have been selected.

The lack of a Nat Sci skills module was raised at a recent SSLC. Having such a module as 20 credits and having to fit it in a timetable slot would greatly reduce choice.

PHA – nothing received from the Teaching Director

5. ENV Response to email from Caroline Sauverin (16/4/15) To School Staff-Student Liaison Committees

Comment from ENV final year

The only bullet point I disagree with is the concentrating of the exam period- I think if someone has 6 exams then shortening the total period of which they may become assessed may mean less quality revision will be done.

I think if the pass rate is 40% (please correct if wrong), then students should need to pass all modules to continue, unless for extenuating circumstance (which of course is dealt elsewhere anyway).

The loss of 10 credit modules may be a shame as it provided me with a greater range of modules when I had them in year 2.

I also believe it a shame that students cannot choose free choice modules, as I for one have benefitted from this for the past 2 years taking modules from history and languages.

These are my views - the rest of bullet points are fine.

Comment from ENV final year

I wouldn't mind an exam period being reduced to 4 weeks but it cannot break the rule of having two exams in one day. Also, if it meant my exams would follow consecutively then

I would want it to stay at 6 weeks. Also I think the year weightings should be shown more clearly as they are different (something which I did not know).

Comment from ENV final year

Since joining in 2012 I have definitely seen changes in the way courses and assessments are run, mostly in a positive light. However, recently I have somewhat felt very disappointed in the way our course profile choices have now been 'pre-defined' by our course directors and the option of a 'free choice' module has been completely withdrawn. It was most disappointing that students were not even pre-warned about this, or at least if they had been, it was certainly not communicated to those on a year in industry or a year abroad.

I have already had a separate conversation with *the LTS Team Leader* about my concerns over the change in course structure, as it really did confuse me that the course profile had changed without anyone telling me. I highlighted to *her* that there were some large errors in the way they had grouped our modules, forcing me to take options that I never would have chosen if I had seen this course structure when I first joined university in 2012. There has also been large confusion around the wording of the defined module brackets such as "choose 0-60 credits from these options".....what does that mean??? I don't see how any these changes have favoured the students, as I have been speaking with my peers on different ENV courses that feel the same way as I do.

All being said, I am happy with the modules I am taking for the last year of my degree now (there was also an error with a module not being included in my course that should have been), but ultimately the changes to module options should have been much more clearly communicated to the students before online module selection opened.

The rest of the changes that I have seen at university have been in a positive and welcoming manner which I hope continues. It will be interesting to see how they fit everyone's exams down to 4 weeks as opposed to 6 next year - I will wait in anticipation!

Discussion

1. A number of concessions against the regulations were considered, as detailed in Table One. The two that were approved concerned a) progression from Foundation Year to Stage One, as one-off; the course has subsequently been redesigned to drop the requirement of a compulsory language programme and b) to allow the progression of students to a year abroad who had failed to meet the threshold of 55%, with the recommendation that the thresholds be reviewed.
2. The amendment to the regulation, to combine exams and course tests at reassessment, did not have a large uptake and caused a bit of confusion, so the original regulations have been reverted to, although a concession may be granted for any School/module that wished to continue to combine the two.
3. As expected, there has been an increase in the percentage of students who did not progress at first attempt, with the introduction of the requirement to pass all modules. In

addition, the number of students progressing to their next year decreased by 2.3%, comparing 2012/3 year 1 with 2013/4 year 1. There is a corresponding increase in the number of students who did not continue at UEA (increased by 1%, or 33 students) or transferred/repeated/intercalated (increased by 1.4%).

4. Also new with the BIM regulations, module marks within 0.5% of a pass mark were awarded a pass. Two students on the foundation year passed modules with a mark of below 40%, one at first sit and one at reassessment; both went on to pass the year. Thirty students in Year 1 passed modules with a mark of below 40%. Of these, 19 passed all other modules, and therefore did not go to reassessment; 11 students were referred to reassessment in other modules, and 9 of these 11 went on to pass the year, one is intercalating and one failed at reassessment and was withdrawn from the course.
5. Reassessment is by assessment item failed wherever possible. This means that where a module has been failed students will reassess in whichever item/s within that module originally failed, which has increased the number of reassessments. This should reduce again if there is further reduction to the amount of summative assessment across a course.
6. There is a planned reduction in the May/June assessment period. The 2015/6 assessment period is expected to be 5 weeks, with 2016/7 onwards expected to be 4 weeks. It is expected that the two weeks gained will be integrated into the two semesters to provide more ongoing induction, employability initiatives and revision sessions.
7. The outcome of students who failed modules with a mark of below 20% is interesting. At Stages 2 and 3, students with a module mark of below 20% will not automatically have a right to reassessment, but at foundation year and Stage 1 they do automatically go to reassessment. Out of interest, we looked at how many students would have failed the '20%' threshold, and their outcome. Out of the 70 students who failed a module with a mark of below 20% (17 at foundation level, and 53 at Stage One), not one student progressed to the next academic year on the course they were studying on. 84% failed the year, 7% intercalated, 7% repeated the year and 1% transferred to another course. Schools should be aware that this group of students, if permitted to go to reassessment, are likely to require significant support for reassessment if they are to be successful.
8. Joint degrees have a Course Director from the School in which students are registered and Assistant Course Directors from other Schools contributing to the course. Students on joint degrees across Schools in some instances continue to be dissatisfied with their experience due to the lack of communication from the 'other' School. Plans are now in place to improve this by a) identifying all joint courses across Schools and flagging this on SITS and b) ensuring each course has an assistant course director from the other School, with full access to the information that the lead course director has, and communications from both Schools go to these students. Initially this will be via a manual checklist, but it is hoped that this can be automated via SITS/SPOT in due course.
9. Course structures were reviewed before implementation and continue to be reviewed annually. In addition to ensuring they meet the requirements of BIM, there will be further reductions in the number of assessments, the amount of summative assessments and small module enrolments, in line with Senate's 'direction of travel'. Although not set out as one of the key principles of the New Academic Model, the increased use of formative (and subsequent decrease in summative) assessment was explicitly stated in the New

Academic Model programme templates and guidance, and continues to be an important theme in the evolution of the assessment strategies. The engagement with formative assessment is an important measure of students' engagement with their studies and will be looked at as part of any Attendance, Engagement and Progress concerns. Formative assessment was only recorded on SITS from 2013/4, so is included here as a benchmark for future reviews.

10. Feedback was sought from Faculty LTQCs. Those that have submitted comments have raised some interesting issues. It is clear that colleagues would benefit from having more time to consult and respond, and from having access to the accompanying statistics for their Schools, for the next (2nd) report, following the progression outcomes of this year's exam and reassessment boards. Further feedback from students will also be sought.
11. The data here is for information only and will provide a useful benchmark to continue to measure the impact of BIM over the next few years. The first graduates from the new regulations will be at the end of the next academic year, 2015/6.

Table 7 4.6. Issues raised by colleagues (Chairs of Boards of Examiners, secretaries to Exam Boards, Teaching Directors)

Issue	School	Possible solution	Feedback/ Further action
1 This year, the PVC-Academic approved a concession to change the default reassessment, so that if a module has both a course test and an exam as summative assessments, where a student has failed the module and has failed both the course test and the exam, he or she will be reassessed in the exam only. This is on the understanding that the exam will be assessing the same learning outcomes as the course test. This now needs to be reviewed to ensure we have decisions in place for this year's BIM modules, level 0, 4 and 5.	All	This has little take up in the end; it was decided to keep to the original expectation that items in failed modules will be reassessed individually as the default, but to be sympathetic to concession requests where there is a good pedagogical argument.	
2 How to manage external examiner approval of 3rd exam papers for students eligible for conditional progression	All	Discuss the necessity to get EE's approval of 3rd exam papers with the ADTP	ADTP declared that approval by EE s is not required
3 Schools wishing to change/get a concession for progression thresholds eg AMA wish to abandon the additional threshold of 55% at end of first year (but keep it at end of 2nd year)	AMA	Having brought in standardisation following a full consultation, a number of Schools have asked for concessions against the regulations. Currently managed via concession, but will be reviewed as part of review of thresholds and study abroad	Ongoing - To consider in 2014/.5 as part of bigger review of how study abroad is recognised and promoted. Things have moved on, in that Semester Abroads are becoming more popular to offer.
4 Concessions for students who have failed a module and are allowed to progress (with a failed module). Such a concession was approved by ADTP for a student with extenuating circumstances. It was suggested that ECP powers be revised so that this is something that ECP could approve.	ENV		No action required - this will continue to be a concession considered by ADTP.
5 Re streaming and putting high calibre students into higher level modules (eg math modules). When these students fail a module at assessment, are referred to reassessment and fail again, the argument is that they would have passed and progressed had they taken the lower level module. It has been agreed that ADTP will consider concessions in such cases and look at these on an individual basis.	BIO+ENV	See related concession background in supporting doc folder (KG)	Where there is streaming like this, there needs to be an early triage system to assess capabilities and move to lower module if necessary. ADTP/CS to remind colleagues.
6 Re students who have been referred to reassessment (BIM) but who are at the same time as the reassessment Board takes place, attending a field course prior to their next stage of study (which is usually what occurs for the BIO field course). If the student fails the module at reassessment, should they be told to return from their field course and be withdrawn from the University, due to failure of a module?	BIO	See background doc (KG)	yes they should. No further action - other than the School making this clear to students in their correspondence.
7 One clarification point: Under the BIM students have to pass all modules. On the Year Abroad – does this apply to the modules taken overseas – or does it apply to the single module into which the Year Abroad fits within the UEA BIM degree scheme? My preferred solution would be the latter as it allows students to test themselves overseas, and it allows students to offset any problems against other module choices.	ENV		the Board of Examiners will consider whether the student has passed the year abroad. If they haven't, they need to be given an opportunity to be reassessed, if possible, as stipulated in the regulation 12.6 http://www.uea.ac.uk/calendar/section3/regs(awards)/Regulations+for+Bachelors+and+Integrated+Masters+Awards+2014/12.+Stage+Assessment+Board
8 BIM is currently not clear about whether capped or uncapped marks should be used for progression purposes. This needs to be clarified.	ENV		this has been clarified in the 2014/5 Regulations, 15.1.(c) ' the capped mark ...for use in progression and final assesment for degree clasification.
9 BIM is not clear about the simultaneous occurrence of DA and reassessment - a newly created problem due to the possibility to be delayed assessed in coursework components. E.g., where a student has an outstanding DA in a module with multiple assessment components, which they would otherwise fail after the June exam period, they would only be taking DA in September in the relevant component, but not reassessment in the other components (we had one such case this year). I understand that for year 0 and 1 student we can grant a concession at the September reassessment board to allow them to sit the reassessment (if required) before end of October 2014 but this creates several other problems: - uncertainty about progression; - unfairness for year 2 and 3 students who do not enjoy the same opportunity; - additional administrative burdens on LTS and module organisers. It would be preferable to allow such students to sit DA and reassessment together in September. It would be left to the student to decide which option they take - DA, reassessment or both. If they achieve sufficient marks in the DA, the resulting module mark would count; otherwise the reassessment mark.	ENV	See supporting doc for background / example. A student could undertake a DA and Reassess component for the same module at the same time BUT cannot undertake Reassess for a failed component if they have a DA for the same module. Confirmation from Adam is: "The student is not deemed to have failed a module until the student has failed the assessment for that module - that includes any Delayed Assessment. Only at the point where a Module Fail mark is confirmed by the Exam Board can a student be offered a Reassessment opportunity in the failed assessment components. To do otherwise would be to undermine our own regulations. It is a moot point whether your preferred solution would be in the student's best interests since we cannot and should not pre-judge the outcome of the DA." (KG)	No action required - the regulations will continue to be followed, as detailed under 'possible solution', for the time being, but this should be kept under review.
10 Regarding point 11 above, I think this should be "ECP should have powers to seek a concession." At the moment, only FACP have the power to seek a concession in such cases.	ENV		No - regulation stands as it is.
11 I would add something about the time and cost involved in some of the reassessment at item level. For example I have an assessed practical and so the technicians spent time and chemicals setting this up. I then waited 30 mins plus in the lab and the student did not turn up. I understand that students only pay for reassessments that they actually attend. I wonder if we can get some sort of commitment from students before the reassessment that they will turn up so that we don't waste time and money on setting something up which won't then be used?	BIO		we are considering changing to students registering and paying in advance. (do we deny them reassessment if they do not pay by the deadline?) Working group to consider, led by Lynne Ward.
12 The ECP noted that organising reassessments (particularly practicals) involved staff time and cost and that students had not engaged with any reassessments. The ECP questioned whether: (i) Reassessments can be cancelled if students have not paid reassessment fees by a specified deadline date (ii) Students should pay reassessment fees irrelevant of whether they attend (this might encourage students to attend)	BIO		as above
13 Failure rate and resulting increase in appeals from NBS	NBS		noted. No action just now - keep under review
14 In ECO the main impact of BIM is the significant effect on the number of students who failed to progress to year 2 – we lost around 20 students at the end of the first year (more than in previous years). There was a high fail rate on the Introductory Economics 40 credit module. Under the CCS regs students who failed 40 credits with an overall average of at least 40% would have progressed.	ECO		noted. No action just now - keep under review
15 On a more positive note, more formative assessment is being used; the feedback students receive can feed forward and help them improve their summative assessment marks.	ECO		this should ultimately improve the failure rate. No action required.
16 The fact that final year students are not able to take level 4 modules poses a problem in that this would bar Schools from including many foreign language modules within the list of 'defined choice'. Having to apply for individual concessions for each student wishing to take such a foreign language module is yet another time consuming procedure.	LAW		noted. No action just now - keep under review

Table 7 4.6. Issues raised by colleagues (Chairs of Boards of Examiners, secretaries to Exam Boards, Teaching Directors)

Issue	School	Possible solution	Feedback/ Further action
17 20 credit versions of 30 credit modules. This is an issue in some Schools, to ensure that modules are available to out-of-School courses. This is not really in the spirit of NAM as there is increased complexity and associated admin costs associated with having two versions.	HUM		schools to consider options.
18 Future timetabling of BIM reassessments around reassessment exams	All	Look at a) moving reassessment to give us more time b) AQO Coordinator to discuss further at coordinators' meeting to join this up a bit better.	J Whiting to take forward with other LTS Coordinators
19 Setting deadlines for coursework - academics need to know the reassessment exam timetable further in advance to slot in coursework demos and presentations. Overseas students had most problems because they were very worried about planning for flights and visas.	SCI - don't know School	Look at a) moving reassessment to give us more time b) AQO Coordinator to discuss further at coordinators' meeting to join this up a bit better and ensure that the reassessment timetable gets published as soon as possible.	J Whiting to take forward with other LTS Coordinators
20 Faculty were being asked to produce assignments at very short notice - better publicity for the deadlines would help	SCI - don't know School	publish deadlines to receive CW tasks (assuming that there will be fails), from whom and by when.	J Whiting to take forward with other LTS Coordinators
21 Reassessment marks spreadsheets did not differentiate between assignments so that a student with multiple reassessments for a module appeared several times, with no indication of the assignment which the entry related to. Faculty had to split and manually recreate the spreadsheets for each assignment	SCI - don't know School	See Point 29 (KG)	this was a technical problem which needs solving. C Chan to take up with the review of exam board paperwork in time for any delayed reassessment in June 2015
22 Under BIM, if a student fails a module all failed components will have to be reassessed. This may be difficult to implement and timetable (eg failed presentations and course tests) in a short reassessment period	ECO - but affects all	look at extending the reassessment period and identify a day for coursetests. See also (2) and (5) above	J Whiting to take forward with other LTS Coordinators; reassessment has been extended for 2014/5
23 Students who have narrowly failed have been sent incorrect information about appeals (in the post board letter) and no useful advice as to what they should do next...there is a lack of advice available to these students (eg transferring them to another institution, or repeating the year'	ENV	suggestion to add something into the letters for failed students, along the lines of : an Academic Appeal or Complaint can be made if you wish to raise concerns about an academic decision (e.g. mark, result, degree classification, etc), your programme of study or its associated academic facilities. If you wish to submit an Appeal about this you can find information about the University's procedure here: https://www.uea.ac.uk/learningandteaching/students/appealsandcomplaints The Advice Centre in the Students Union (http://www.ueastudent.com/advice) can also advise you on any appropriate course of action if you are unhappy with the outcome of your reassessment.	this has been actioned.
24 Number of reassessment course tests and difficulties with provision of invigilators	NBS		The AQO should be able to support course tests with the correct number of invigilators. Referred to J Whiting for review and planning
25 Discretionary progression following successful appeals. With reassessment boards taking place in early September, some student appeals are not submitted until mid or late September. This then leads to a very short timescale for FACP's to consider the appeal, then if upheld, for the student to revise for the reassessment attempt.	NBS		look at process to see if it can be streamlined. It may be in the student's interest to intercalate, if the decision is very late - progression is discretionary, and doesn't need to be offered.
26 Related to the above point, where the student concerned is a Tier 4 student, as soon as the withdrawal goes through SITS the UKBA team advise the Home Office and the students visa is withdrawn. If an appeal is subsequently upheld then the students visa needs to be reinstated, which can take some time. This could then result in the 30th October deadline not being able to be met.	NBS	LTS teams need to be more aware of the implications for Tier 4 students and FACP's should be encouraged to hear such cases quickly.	Need to ensure good communication between LTS and UKVI team in ARM plus DOS team. We are restricted by the Tier 4 regulations.
27 SITS Issues: RAS screen has no option to input reassessment marks by component (only by module). This was raised at SIS training with Jo C...	All	Response from SITS team 23/10/14: This will need to be sent to Tribal as a PMR (Product Modification Request). It will need to be voted on and then if successful it will be developed and included within a future upgrade. This is a long process but we can certainly try.	need to ensure that staff are aware of alternatives. Keep the PMR under review (C Sauverin/K Goodby)
28 SITS Issues: Inability to input EC, IN and PM flag into RAS record (at component level- UG). Not sure why this is the case- some students experienced EC's that needed flagging prior to any concession (E1) being granted. Students can be penalised for late submission of reassessment CW or be granted extensions for reassessment coursework.	All	Response from SITS team 23/10/14: We can control the mark schemes from within planning, and they differ depending on Old or New academic model. Was this one for PGT modules? Adding EC, IN and PM shouldn't be a problem but will need to be thought out correctly. We will add this to our next review of the mark schemes.	review this with Planning Office - K Goodby
29 SITS Issues: Issue with reassessment CW- as per attached email- see email in folder. How easy / possible would it be to add a new assessment type flag of 'PW'?	BIO/ENV/ possibly other Schools	Response from SITS team 23/10/14: This one will need to be discussed. There are many reasons for having the assessment types as they are and they are replied upon by many e:Vision tasks. This will probably need to be escalated within LTS but it is possible to add in additional assessment types, but there may be a better way of doing this.	review this with Planning Office - K Goodby
30 Discoverer Reports: Noted that the 'marks by student reports' would highlighted as a 'pass modules' any module with a mark of at least 39.50 BUT that the Rank Order lists still list 39.50 'pass' modules as 'fail modules' (in the marks profile section). This caused some confusion for Board members who tend to use the rank orders as an overview. I'm not sure if this can be amended in view of the fact that Discover is no longer supported re: developments?	All		Karin Goodby and Christina Chan to look at as part of Exam Board paperwork review

Table 7 4.6. Issues raised by colleagues (Chairs of Boards of Examiners, secretaries to Exam Boards, Teaching Directors)

Issue	School	Possible solution	Feedback/ Further action
31 Future organisation of DA and Reassessment CT's, which have increased as result of BIM.	All	Can these be arranged centrally by the Assessments Office to take place, along side examinations, to take place during the main assessment periods. See supporting document for suggestions	Not something that can be done simply. J Whiting to take forward with other LTS Coordinators
32 Improved communication to BIM students re: requirements of course and the appeals process if they are withdrawn	All		Letters out to students have been amended to clarify this.
33 Online submission of reassessment CW (via eVision). ENV UG participated in a pilot for reassessments 2013-14 and, although the pilot sample was small, the process worked well without problems	All		this should be available for all in 2014/5. Exam Board working group (Christina/Lynne) to check with SITS team that this is happening.
34 During reassessment 2013-14, teams had to send out separate emails about reassessment CW and how to obtain details of tasks	All	Standard SITS Reassessment letter for CW to be produced OR additional information provided in existing SITS letter. All info should be incorporated into one letter/email that can be sent to the student- so that they have all info in one place	Exam Board working group to ensure this happens
35 More DA's being offered by Board as a result of EC process (i.e. ECP can recommend further DA for components already passed). Makes scheduling of assessments in August more difficult due to a) increase in cases and b) fact that student can choose whether to undertake DA, and retain first sit mark if decide not to show to further DA exam.	All	EC review rather than BIM? Solution to be able to better organise would be to assume student wants DA opportunity and set deadline date by which student must opt out. Obtain zero mark if no-show at DA exam.	The EC regs require a deadline date to opt out by - no action required other than to follow process
36 Collusion and plagiarism - how can this be managed for reassessment coursework within the timescale?	SCI - don't know School	Bring forward reassessment to give process more time	this isn't really a BIM issue; P&C should be managed out of assessment.
37 Several scenarios had not been thought through in BIM, e.g. the impact of intercalation in January on year-long modules.	SCI - don't know School	this isn't really a BIM issue - was already an issue in Schools with year-long modules	Schools should ensure that, when they support i/c requests mid year, there are suitable arrangements in place for students to return to.
38 For some reasons this year we had a whole load of duplicate SAW records for any student who completed assessments in August. guess some kind of background system process had been run by mistake(?) as it wasn't anything to do with the way that we process awards. This occurred for other Schools too	BIO/ENV		If it happens again, need to get specific examples to SIS.records at the time of identification.
39 For coursework reassessments (of which there will be many more under BIM) the current timetable does not allow us to do anything about plagiarism or collusion, as the Reassessment Board is so close to the submission or demonstration dates.	CMP		this isn't really a BIM issue; P&C should be managed out of assessment.
40 The first concerns The ECPs which continue to take up vast amounts of time and is a wholly unsatisfactory procedure	LAW		this is not a BIM issue - refer to Jon Sharp re review of EC's regs in due course.
41 In addition the Exam Board agreed that (i) Organising reassessments (particularly practicals) involved staff time and costs. This is frustrating when students had not engaged with any reassessments. This was also discussed at the ECP meeting on 5 September. The ECP questioned whether reassessments can be cancelled if students have not paid reassessment fees by a specified deadline date and / or whether students should pay reassessment fees irrelevant of whether they attend (this might encourage students to attend) (ii) The Board agreed that the most important factor is that a reassessment task should assess the same learning outcomes as the original task and that, as long as this is the case, the mode of reassessment could be different from the original mode of assessment. It was noted that this should be explicitly stated in the regulations(iii) It was agreed that this would be discussed / investigated further at the Teaching Executive committee	BIO		as above. NB If Schools would like to reassess by an alternative method, this will be considered for approval by the ADTP. As long as the same learning outcomes are being tested as the original task then this is likely to be approved.
42 Joint Courses - ensuring that the students are appropriately supported with having two course directors			ensure that joint courses DO have two course directors (and Advising policy is picking up having a key contact in the 2nd School, with lead Adviser in the School owning the Course/registering the student.