ITEM – Deliverable 2.5 Progress Report

Group #5: Tracking Software. Led by Universum

- Participants: Universum, FINKI, UMIT, HIT, TEI, ULL
- Describe the requirements from the software that helps to identify students at risk of falling behind

- **Challenge in Predicting Software**:
  - ▷ Country dependent information, culture, different LMSs
  - ▷ It will be difficult to build a unified tool that will include all the information

First e-meeting conclusions

- <u>Initial Thoughts</u> - devise two-tier approach:

  1. Provide a very simple predictive tool that can be applied easily anywhere by using information that is readily available => **Moodle system – weekly exams and access to mobile applications**.

  2. Provide a more sophisticated tools that takes into account different types of information that is harder to collect and may not be available in all locations e.g., background, geographic, demographic and cultural information. One of the questions is whether it is worth building such a tool, i.e., assuming that this model provides better prediction, does this improvement worth the hassle of fine tuning the model and using harder to collect information.

First e-meeting follow-up

- <u>We distributed a questionnaire to understand the current state of programs and policies that partner institutions use :</u>

  1. Do you already perform (manual and/or automatic) detection of "students at risk of failure"?

  2. Independent of whether you already perform such a risk analysis or not: Which data would you have available in structured and electronic form to conduct an automatic risk analysis in the future

- 100% response rate on the questionnaire

- UC compiled a report on findings and disseminated among the members of Working Group #5 and they are located at

Partner feedback on the questionnaire

- Summary of responses

  - ▷ The vast majority of partners have policies/programs in place to track and prevent students who fall behind

  - ▷ Institutions use various types of data: demographic, learning performance (grades, test scores), data from Moodle (attendance, grades) etc.

  - ▷ There is no automatic detection in place at iTEM partners. Some use semi-automatic and manual detection

  - ▷ Aalborg and La Laguna implemented projects in the past that aimed at detecting and preventing students from failing in college

Deliverable 2.5: Questions to be discussed

1. Do all agree that we should start detecting students-at-risk based on results of (bi-weekly, automatic) progress tests in Moodle and maybe also based on Moodle access data?

2. Is seems that not all test institutions use Moodle: Are these institutions willing to implement Moodle and start working with it?

3. Is there a test institution willing to work on a more complex approach of detecting students-at-risk, e.g. by analyzing more information from Moodle, student information system (predictive modeling)?

4. Do we need a guideline describing how instructors should use the information from the student-at-risk analysis (how to react, etc.)?