Grade distribution tables

at Pope John Paul II State School of Higher Education in Biała Podlaska

I. What is grade distribution?

Due to different cultural and academic traditions, European educational systems have developed not only different national grading scales but also different ways of using them within the same country, in different subject areas or institutions. While it is essential to acknowledge these differences, it is also important to make them transparent within the European Higher Education Area, so that grades awarded in all countries, subject areas or institutions can be properly understood and correctly compared.

Mobile students have the right to fair treatment and to transparency of their grades when credits are transferred from one institution to another, as access to further studies, grants or other benefits may depend on their level of performance. Transparency of performance levels is equally important for graduates applying for a job in their own or in another country.

To ensure transparent and coherent information on the performance of the individual student, each HEI should provide – in addition to their national/institutional grading scale and an explanation of the scale – a statistical distribution table of the passing grades awarded in the programme or field of study attended by the student (grade distribution table) showing how the grading scale is actually used in that programme. The grade distribution table was first introduced in the ECTS Users' Guide in 2009, as a replacement for the previous ECTS grading scales (A, B, C, D, E), which are not used anymore.

Even in cases when transferring the grades is not necessary in the local academic tradition of receiving institutions, calculating a grade distribution table will facilitate fair treatment of the incoming students on their return to the sending institution. It should be noted that it is also good practice to provide internal boards of examiners with detailed statistical data on examination grading in order to make the process more transparent and indicate any disparities which may indicate issues for further consideration.

II. How to develop a grade distribution table

Grade distribution tables have to be developed in a standardised format for reference groups of students enrolled in degree programmes belonging to the same field of studies. Such groups should be of reliable size in terms of number of students and number of years considered.

1. Identify the reference groups within your institution by using objective and transparent criteria which should be attached to the grade distribution tables produced. In the absence of methods based on comparable learning outcomes, it is recommended to use the ISCED-F classification which offers a standardised and hierarchical classification of fields of study. In order to have reference groups that are large enough for a statistically relevant comparison, it

is recommended to use an ISCED code at the "narrow" or 'detailed' levels (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2014)

2. Calculate the absolute number of passing grades awarded to each reference group identified in at least the last two years. Remember that information on success rates may be provided in general terms but not in this calculation.

3. Calculate the grade distribution in terms of percentages of the passing grades awarded to the reference group and develop cumulative percentages. As a result, there will be a grade distribution table with percentages and cumulative percentages for each reference group identified.

III. Description of the reference group

The basis of reference for developing the grading tables at the University are the actual learning outcomes in individual fields of study for first-cycle studies in the last two academic years (i.e. 2018/19 and 2019/20). The reference group for the analysis was adopted individually for each field of study, on which a possible mobility activities of foreign students is registered.

The data is valid until: **31 December 2021.**

English Philology

Grades used in institution (from highest to lowest passing grade)	Number of passing grades awarded to the reference group	Percentage of each grade with respect to the total passing grades awarded	Cumulative percentage of passing grades awarded
5.0	1618	23%	23%
4.5	918	13%	36%
4.0	1558	22%	58%
3.5	1100	16%	74%
3.0	1837	26%	100%
Success rate: 77 %			

Tourism and Recreation

Grades used in institution (from highest to lowest passing grade)	Number of passing grades awarded to the reference group	Percentage of each grade with respect to the total passing grades awarded	Cumulative percentage of passing grades awarded
5.0	2244	31%	31%
4.5	1118	16%	47%
4.0	1488	21%	68%
3.5	897	13%	80%
3.0	1398	20%	100%

Success rate: 71%

Pedagogy

Grades used in institution (from highest to lowest passing grade)	Number of passing grades awarded to the reference group	Percentage of each grade with respect to the total passing grades awarded	Cumulative percentage of passing grades awarded
5.0	2999	46%	46%
4.5	921	14%	61%
4.0	1248	19%	80%
3.5	511	8%	88%
3.0	790	12%	100%

Success rate: 91%

Nursing

Grades used in institution (from highest to lowest passing grade)	Number of passing grades awarded to the reference group	Percentage of each grade with respect to the total passing grades awarded	Cumulative percentage of passing grades awarded
5.0	8227	59%	59%
4.5	1652	12%	71%
4.0	2223	16%	87%
3.5	712	5%	92%

3.0	1175	8%	100%
Success rate: 95%			

Management

Grades used in institution (from highest to lowest passing grade)	Number of passing grades awarded to the reference group	Percentage of each grade with respect to the total passing grades awarded	Cumulative percentage of passing grades awarded
5.0	786	19%	19%
4.5	534	13%	32%
4.0	959	23%	55%
3.5	688	17%	72%
3.0	1148	28%	100%
Success rate: 74%			

Economics

Grades used in institution (from highest to lowest passing grade)	Number of passing grades awarded to the reference group	Percentage of each grade with respect to the total passing grades awarded	Cumulative percentage of passing grades awarded
5.0	634	20%	20%
4.5	420	13%	34%
4.0	732	23%	57%
3.5	567	18%	75%
3.0	771	25%	100%
Success rate: 78%			

The compilation of the grading table is based on the 2015 ECTS User Guide.

Agnieszka Kaliszuk
Adam Szepeluk