

Degree Outcomes Statement

A summary of degree outcomes is contained in the table below. The data in the table reflect a significant level of consistency in the awarding of 'good' degrees across the five-year period – with 2019-20 being an exceptional year owing to the COVID-19 pandemic.

All Undergraduate Degrees								
Number of Degrees	5YR Trend	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	+/- Pr Year	5YR Mean
I		182	209	213	240	207	-33	210
2.I		396	452	396	317	335	18	379
2.II		139	156	145	88	96	8	125
3		19	15	20	6	7	1	13
Total Classified Degrees		736	832	774	651	645	-6	734
1st and 2.I Class		578	661	609	557	542	-15	589
Proportion	5YR Trend	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	+/- Pr Year	5YR Mean
I		24.7%	25.1%	27.5%	36.9%	32.1%	▲ -4.8%	28.6%
2.I		53.8%	54.3%	51.2%	48.7%	51.9%	▲ 3.2%	51.6%
2.II		18.9%	18.8%	18.7%	13.5%	14.9%	▲ 1.4%	17.0%
3		2.6%	1.8%	2.6%	0.9%	1.1%	▲ 0.2%	1.8%
Total Classified Degrees		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%
1st and 2.I Class		78.5%	79.4%	78.7%	85.6%	84.0%	▲ -1.6%	80.3%

Our classification ratio has been relatively stable throughout the five year period, with an increase in first class awards during 2019/20 which was covered by the previous year's Degree Outcomes Statement.

Appendix A provides an extract from *Institutional Annual Quality Report 2020-21 (IAQR)* which includes data on degree classification outcomes which are analysed by Student Characteristic and by School and Academic Group.

1. Assessment and Marking Practices

Assessments are set to enable students to evidence that they have met the learning outcomes associated with their programme of study. These are set according to the level of the programme award (i.e. Level 3 Foundation Year; Level 4 –6 Undergraduate and Level 7 Masters) which are in turn aligned to the threshold standard for the level described in the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications. In instances where programmes have Professional Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRBs) accreditation or part accreditation some assessment requirements may be set by those bodies.

To support academic colleagues in applying consistent marking practices, a University *Handbook on Assessment Practice - Guide for Staff* describes all the processes associated with assessment practice including use of marking criteria, standardisation, internal moderation, double marking, sampling and verification, and external moderation by external examiners. External Examiners are appointed for programmes, including those delivered by academic partners, through a process which considers the suitability of the nominee in terms of both relevant subject coverage and experience (with mentors assigned as necessary) and consideration of any inadvertent reciprocity either between individuals or between LTU and the home institution of the external. Module assessment outcomes are submitted to Assessment Panels which include External Examiners; recommendations for progression and awards are

submitted to Progression and Award Boards. These Boards also have oversight of the assessment outcomes from collaborative partners.

If students believe there are reasons why they may not be able to perform to the best of their ability, there are two process available to them to ensure these are considered and taken into account if deemed to be justifiable. They are the *Mitigating Circumstances Policy and Procedure* and an *Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure*. The former enables students to submit for consideration of mitigating circumstances *prior to* submission of assessment and the latter for reconsideration of outcomes on certain criteria *subsequent* to the publication of assessment outcomes. These processes are conducted by professional and academic staff who are trained in the requirements of the process; records are maintained which provide an archive of case law which supports consistency in application, and, in the case of Academic Appeals, an annual report is produced which analyses appeals by subject group and student characteristics and makes recommendations for any change or enhancement to the process.

The use of External Examiners, and their annual reports; the Procedural External Reviewer (who oversees the operation of Progression and Award Boards); the inclusion of progression and award data in the *Institutional Annual Quality Report (IAQR)* and other reporting – are all mechanisms which provide evidence on which the University can judge the effectiveness of its assessment and marking practices. An institutional overview report is produced which provides a thematic analysis of all external examiner reports.

In 2018/19 the University changed its marking protocols from predominantly granular numeric marking to a categorical marking protocol. Staff were supported in the application of the new marking arrangements through staff development and workshops and guidance for its application is described in the *Handbook on Assessment Practice* referred to above.

2 Academic Governance

Progression and Award Boards have delegated authority from the Academic Board to approve progression and award decisions on recommendations arising from Assessment Panels, including those conducted by the University's academic partnerships.

Part A of the *Institutional Annual Quality Report (IAQR)* highlights features of change, good practice or recommendations arising from the implementation of the University's usual processes of quality assurance (which are aligned to the UK Quality Code for England Core Practices for standards and quality) undertaken during the preceding academic year. Part B of the *IAQR* considers 3-yearly trend data of student progression and retention by level and student characteristic and as stated previously looks at degree outcome data.

3 Classification Algorithms

The University has a degree classification algorithm which uses three methods of calculation with the best outcome determining the classification awarded. The three methods start with an arithmetic mean of marks for the 240 credits studied at Level 5 and 6; an arithmetic mean mark weighted in ratio 2:1 in favour of Level 6 and finally a mark profile (classification) across Level 5 and 6 weighted in ratio 2:1 in favour of Level 6. The number of credits at each classification is summed until 50% of credits (180) have been accounted for. The Honours classification will then be classification at which the process of summation ends.

These three methods of calculation support the rationale that performance may:

- show a strong performance over all years of the programme (calculation i);
- show performance more strongly in the final year as the student becomes able to make connections across the breadth of the programme (calculation ii and iii).

The use of both average mark and profile allows for the recognition of both consistent performance across the programme (profile) and exceptional areas of strength. Our procedures and regulations make no allowance for any special consideration to be given to borderline marks.

Algorithms are described in the *TPAR* which are published in the myLTU app (Essential Information) as the prime location for student information and on the University's website. Module and Personal Tutors support students in understanding how their award outcome will be calculated and a '*Degree Calculator*' is available to enable students to input known marks which then calculates their potential outcome - enabling students to aim for the best possible classification. Prior to the final classification of award, which is confirmed by the Progression and Award Boards, there are mechanisms which allow for resits of failed modules. In these cases, marks are capped at the pass mark (40% for undergraduate programmes).

The University had a review of its academic regulations in 2017/18 undertaken by an external consultant. The appointment process was by tender with criteria designed to establish suitability to undertake the task with particular reference to knowledge of sector practice and academic standards informed by the FHEQ, QAA [Subject] Benchmark Standards and the QAA Quality Code.¹ This can provide assurance to the University that its regulations are in line with sector norms. This is also endorsed by External Examiners who are asked to confirm comparability of standards with the sector.

We are confident that our algorithm is in alignment with sector practice, as set out in the UKSCQA document and the UUK/GuildHE report on the configuration of degree algorithms. However, the University is committed to reviewing algorithm design to ensure it remains in alignment with sector standards and would adhere to the UKSCQA Principles for Effective Degree Algorithm Design when carrying out any review.

4 Teaching Practices and Learning Resources

We want all of our students to succeed – both academically and personally – so we have introduced a range of initiatives and developed strategies which support student success and positive outcomes for all students. We believe that the following enhancements in place at Leeds Trinity are likely to have had an effect in improving student academic performance and outcomes:

- Our key element of enhancement in recent years has been linked to the embedding of our **Learning Hub** service. The service works in two ways. Firstly, it works in liaison with module leaders on request to provide specialist skills and assessment workshops embedded within programmes; secondly, it provides bespoke tutorial support for students who refer themselves to the service or who are referred to the service by their programme team. Our data for AY20-21 shows that:

¹ The new academic regulations were approved by Academic Board 28/06/2018.



- Around 1 in 9 students (11%) at level 4 engage in one-on-one tutorials with the Learning Hub. A greater proportion of Level 5 (14%) and Level 6 (18%) students engage with the service with approximately 1 in 6 students attending a tutorial.
 - The usage of the Learning Hub at Level 6 is more even across minority and widening participation demographics. Students that engage with the Learning Hub during Level 6 achieve a higher proportion of 1st/2:1-degree awards (91%) compared to students that do not engage with the Learning Hub during Level 6 (82%).
 - From 1st September 2020 to 31st August 2021, the Learning Hub conducted a total of 2,006 student tutorials and led 45 class workshops. This compares to a total of 1316 student tutorials and 137 workshops in AY 2019/20.
 - With pass rates for those who attend Learning Hub tutorials being higher than for those who do not, increasing engagement with the service is a priority for AY 2021/22. Low engagement from male students (3% in AY 21/22) is a perennial challenge.
-
- The commissioning of Advance HE to support the introduction of **Active Digital Design (ADD)** to ensure consistency of VLE page setup and organisation of teaching and learning materials.
 - The establishment of a **Centre for Excellence in Learning and Teaching** to inspire innovation and excellence in pedagogic practice.
 - The development of **Principles for Academic Delivery** and adoption of an innovative blended learning model based on 'Pre, Live, Post' activities to support independent and flexible learning and build the digital capabilities of students.
 - Curriculum enhancement work and the strategy in place to migrate all undergraduate provision into a **30-credit framework** structure by the end of 2022-23 to support student success and positive outcomes.

APPENDIX A – EXTRACT FROM INSTITUTIONAL ANNUAL QUALITY REPORT 2020/21

3 Part B Student Characteristics and Outcomes

3.8 Awards Outcomes by Graduation Year

Institution Awards by Entry Year

3.8.1. In order to ensure that the awards data is not skewed by poor pass/progression rates prior to graduation, the following table shows all awards made in each graduation year. The table also includes postgraduate awards.

3.8.2. There was only a small cohort of Foundation Degree graduates but the students achieved a high proportion of Distinction awards (56.3%) compared to previous years. There was a sharp increase in the proportion of 1st or 2:1 awards made to undergraduate graduates in 19/20, most of this increase has been maintained in 20/21 with 84.1% of students achieving this degree classification. There was a fall in the proportion of PGCE graduates that achieved a Distinction award but an increase in Distinction awards made to Taught Masters students.

Table 19: Award classification by programme type and graduation year

LTU Campus-Based Foundation Degrees		Graduating Year				
Measure	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	
Intended Awards Made	40	27	28	32	16	
Distinction Class	32.5%	29.6%	46.4%	53.1%	56.3%	
Merit Class	55.0%	59.3%	50.0%	34.4%	31.3%	
Pass Class	12.5%	11.1%	3.6%	12.5%	12.5%	
LTU Campus-Based Undergraduate Degrees		Graduating Year				
Measure	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	
Intended Awards Made	736	832	773	651	646	
1st or 2:1 Class Degrees	78.5%	79.4%	78.7%	85.6%	84.1%	
1st Class Degrees	24.7%	25.1%	27.6%	36.9%	32.0%	
2:1 Class Degrees	53.8%	54.3%	51.1%	48.7%	52.0%	
2:2 Class Degrees	18.9%	18.8%	18.8%	13.5%	14.9%	
3rd Class Degrees	2.6%	1.8%	2.6%	0.9%	1.1%	
LTU Campus-Based PGCE		Graduating Year				
Measure	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	
PGCE Awards Made (L6 or L7)	251	277	307	324	346	
PGCE (L7) Distinction Class	24.7%	22.4%	24.1%	22.2%	19.1%	
PGCE (L7) Merit Class	38.2%	43.0%	46.9%	47.5%	42.2%	
PGCE (L7) Pass Class	29.9%	25.3%	24.8%	29.0%	34.4%	
PGCE (L6) Pass Class	7.2%	9.4%	4.2%	1.2%	4.3%	

3.8.3. LTU campus based students that entered at foundation year and UK franchise partnership students are yet to graduate so do not contribute to the awards data. There are a small number of degree awards made to student on Professional Practice level 6 top-up programmes, these students achieve a higher proportion of 1st/2:1 awards than students that enter at level 4.

Table 20: Undergraduate degree 1st/2:1 awards by cohort and graduation year

Undergraduate Degree Awards	Awards Made (by Graduation Year)					1/2:1 Awards % (by Graduation Year)					
	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	+/- Yr on Yr
September Entry:											
All Students	736	832	773	651	645	78.5%	79.4%	78.7%	85.6%	84.0%	-1.6%
LTU Campus UG Degree (L6 Top-Up)	37	37	34	38	38	89.2%	94.6%	94.1%	92.1%	94.7%	+2.6%
LTU Campus UG Degree (L4 Entry)	699	795	739	613	607	78.0%	78.7%	77.9%	85.2%	83.4%	-1.8%
LTU Campus UG Degree (With FY)	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
UK Franchise UG Degree (With FY)	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

3.8.4. The No Detriment Policy increased the number of methods used to calculate UG awards. The proportion of awards made using an NDP calculation has fallen from 55% last year to 27% in 20/21. In 19/20, when an NDP calculation was used this resulted in a higher proportion of 1st class degrees compared to when an existing calculation was used. However, in 20/21 the profile of award classification is very similar between students that used an NDP calculation and those that didn't.

Table 21: Undergraduate degree 1st/2:1 awards by Calculation Type and graduation year

Undergraduate Degree Awards		Awards Made (by Graduation Year)		% of Total Awards Made (by Grad Year)		1st/2:1 Awards % (by Graduation Year)		
		19/20	20/21	19/20	20/21	19/20	20/21	+/- Yr on Yr
No Detriment Policy (NDP)	NDP Calculation Used	359	175	55%	27%	90.0%	85.1%	-4.9%
	NDP Calculation Not Used	292	470	45%	73%	80.1%	83.6%	+3.5%

3.8.5. The proportion of awards made with classification 1st or 2:1 varies between departments. Teacher Education (Primary Education programmes) students consistently

achieve the highest proportion of 1st/2:1 awards. Sport, Health & Physical Education saw a sharp fall in proportion of 1st/2:1 awards in 20/21 and has the lowest proportion in each year.

Table 22: Undergraduate degree 1st/2:1 awards by School/Department and graduation year

Undergraduate Degree Awards	Awards Made (by Graduation Year)					1/2:1 Awards % (by Graduation Year)					
	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	+/- Yr on Yr
LTU Campus September Entry:											
Total LTU Campus September Entry	736	832	773	651	645	78.5%	79.4%	78.7%	85.6%	84.0%	-1.6%
ICE	307	343	279	257	188	82.7%	84.5%	83.2%	90.7%	94.1%	+3.4%
SCBL	205	244	243	150	199	85.9%	81.6%	80.7%	88.0%	88.9%	+0.9%
SSHS	224	245	251	244	258	66.1%	70.2%	71.7%	78.7%	72.9%	-5.8%
LTU Campus September Entry:											
Total LTU Campus September Entry	736	832	773	651	645	78.5%	79.4%	78.7%	85.6%	84.0%	-1.6%
ICE Children, Young People & Families	189	204	164	152	106	76.2%	79.9%	79.3%	84.9%	92.5%	+7.6%
ICE Teacher Education	118	139	115	105	82	93.2%	91.4%	88.7%	99.0%	96.3%	-2.7%
SCBL Business, Computing and Law	40	65	64	40	71	90.0%	87.7%	82.8%	92.5%	87.3%	-5.2%
SCBL Communication	165	179	179	110	128	84.8%	79.3%	79.9%	86.4%	89.8%	+3.4%
SSHS Social & Behavioural Sciences	89	119	167	146	177	88.8%	81.5%	73.7%	79.5%	78.0%	-1.5%
SSHS Sport, Health & Physical Education	135	126	84	98	81	51.1%	59.5%	67.9%	77.6%	61.7%	-15.9%

3.9 Performance by Student Characteristics and Attainment Gaps

3.9.1. The following tables show progression rates at each level of study and the proportion of graduates awarded a 1st/2:1 for a variety of student characteristics. Table (a) shows actual performance. The 20/21 outcome is shown but in order to mitigate against small cohorts and fluctuation in performance, the combined outcome for the latest 3 years is also shown. Table (b) shows differences in performance between paired characteristics such as male v female.

Campus Based Undergraduate Degrees

3.9.2. It is the expectation of the University that all students accepted onto programmes at LTU should be capable of completing the programme and graduating with a 1st/2:1 award. However, there is substantially lower progression and awards performance across all levels for students that were recruited with certain entry characteristics; students that applied through the clearing process, students with BTEC qualifications and students with low UCAS tariff points (1-32 points for foundation year, 1-80 points for level 4 entry). The attainment gaps are not reducing, most attainment gaps for 20/21 are similar or greater than the last 3 years combined.

Table 23a: Progression rates and 1st/2:1 degree awards by student characteristic

"3 Year" indicates combined outcome for last 3 years

Undergraduate Progression and Awards		FY-L4 Progression		L4-L5 Progression		L5-L6 Progression		1st/2:1 Awards	
		20/21	3 Year	20/21	3 Year	20/21	3 Year	20/21	3 Year
All	All	67.0%	63.0%	78.2%	80.7%	84.9%	89.9%	84.0%	82.5%
Application Type	Clearing	50.0%	52.2%	74.3%	75.1%	74.3%	85.0%	76.8%	75.8%
	Main Cycle	73.7%	69.8%	78.8%	81.6%	86.7%	90.7%	85.1%	83.5%
Entry Qualification Type	BTEC	61.2%	54.8%	73.2%	74.8%	78.0%	86.9%	73.6%	72.4%
	A-Level	71.6%	66.7%	80.2%	82.8%	89.0%	92.4%	88.9%	86.3%
	Other	68.8%	67.5%	80.1%	83.0%	83.1%	87.8%	83.6%	84.9%
Entry Tariff (UCAS Points)	No UCAS Points Recorded	73.4%	67.9%	76.6%	80.3%	84.4%	90.0%	88.9%	85.4%
	Low UCAS Points	55.0%	55.6%	72.1%	76.6%	78.4%	84.7%	78.9%	77.6%
	Higher UCAS Points	68.2%	64.7%	81.0%	82.7%	87.9%	91.9%	85.2%	83.8%

Table 23b: Attainment gaps by student characteristic

Student Characteristic Comparison	FY-L4 Progression		L4-L5 Progression		L5-L6 Progression		1st/2:1 Awards	
	20/21	3 Year	20/21	3 Year	20/21	3 Year	20/21	3 Year
Clearing v Main Cycle Application	-23.7%	-17.6%	-4.5%	-6.5%	-12.4%	-5.7%	-8.3%	-7.7%
BTEC Quals v A-Level	-10.4%	-11.9%	-7.0%	-8.0%	-11.0%	-5.5%	-15.3%	-13.9%
Other Quals v A-Level	-2.8%	+0.8%	-0.1%	+0.2%	-5.9%	-4.6%	-5.3%	-1.4%
No UCAS Points v High UCAS Points	+5.2%	+3.2%	-4.4%	-2.4%	-3.5%	-1.9%	+3.7%	+1.6%
Low UCAS Points v High UCAS Points	-13.2%	-9.1%	-8.9%	-6.1%	-9.5%	-7.2%	-6.3%	-6.2%

3.9.3. The tables below show a range of student attributes. The performance of Asian, Black, Mixed or Other ethnicity students is adverse to white students at every level of study and in 20/21 the attainment gaps at foundation year and level 4 have increased. There is particularly low performance amongst Black and “Other” ethnicity students.

3.9.4. Male students also have much lower performance compared to female students at every level with larger gaps in 20/21 at most levels compared to the 3 year average. The proportion of male students varies across departments (only 8.8% of new entrants at level 4 in Teacher Education were male compared to 59.2% of SHAPE new entrants). However, the attainment gaps by gender exist in every department.

3.9.5. Comparing mature students against young students and students with a disability/learning difficulty against those with no disability, shows similar level 4 to 5 progression rates and 1st/2:1 awards attainment over 3 years, although in 20/21 a negative attainment gap has opened up. There is a negative attainment gap for level 5 to 6 progression but in terms of foundation year to level 4 progression mature students and students with a disability/learning difficulty have higher progression rates.

Table 24a: Progression rates and 1st/2:1 degree awards by student characteristic

“3 Year” indicates combined outcome for last 3 years

Undergraduate Progression and Awards		FY-L4 Progression		L4-L5 Progression		L5-L6 Progression		1st/2:1 Awards	
		20/21	3 Year	20/21	3 Year	20/21	3 Year	20/21	3 Year
All	All	67.0%	63.0%	78.2%	80.7%	84.9%	89.9%	84.0%	82.5%
Age	Mature (Age 21+)	72.8%	67.1%	81.9%	81.3%	80.5%	85.9%	82.7%	84.4%
	Young (Age Under 21)	64.9%	61.7%	77.3%	80.6%	85.7%	90.7%	84.4%	82.0%
Disability	Disability/Learning Difficulty	67.2%	68.0%	77.5%	80.6%	78.4%	86.8%	79.8%	82.6%
	No Disability	66.9%	61.7%	78.1%	80.7%	86.8%	90.8%	84.9%	82.5%
Ethnicity	Asian, Black, Mixed, Other	58.9%	59.1%	75.4%	79.3%	82.1%	85.7%	79.5%	76.2%
	White	72.8%	65.9%	79.4%	81.3%	85.9%	91.1%	85.2%	83.9%
Ethnicity (Detailed)	Asian	61.5%	61.9%	80.6%	82.1%	86.0%	87.8%	78.2%	77.3%
	Black	53.3%	50.0%	66.7%	73.4%	70.4%	80.0%	70.0%	67.3%
	Mixed	58.3%	64.3%	69.8%	77.9%	83.9%	84.9%	87.5%	77.3%
	Other	60.0%	57.1%	50.0%	68.8%	50.0%	76.9%	100.0%	90.0%
	White	72.8%	65.9%	79.4%	81.3%	85.9%	91.1%	85.2%	83.9%
Gender	Male	62.4%	59.6%	71.1%	74.9%	81.7%	87.8%	79.3%	75.0%
	Female	73.2%	67.0%	81.6%	83.7%	86.3%	91.0%	86.4%	86.2%
Accommodation	Off Campus	63.0%	61.1%	76.3%	79.6%	84.2%	89.7%	83.3%	82.9%
	On Campus	76.6%	66.5%	80.6%	81.9%	85.5%	90.1%	84.7%	82.1%

Actions

The following actions which underpin the content of the **2020 and 2021 Degree Outcomes Statements** are in progress:

- Migration of undergraduate provision into a 30-credit framework structure by the end of AY2022-23
- Monitoring the application of the incremental roll-out of categorical marking system

We have identified the following additional actions:

- To review the operation of Assessment Panels and Progression and Award Boards for AY2023-24 to ensure the appropriate targeted support for students and improving reporting as an output from Panels and Boards.