

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	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	+/- Pr Year	5YR Mean
I		209	213	240	207	164	-43	207
2.I		452	396	317	335	294	-41	359
2.II		156	145	88	96	161	65	129
3		15	20	6	7	20	13	14
Total Classified Degrees		832	774	651	645	639	-6	708
1st and 2.I Class		661	609	557	542	458	-84	565
Proportion	5YR Trend	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	+/- Pr Year	5YR Mean
I		25.1%	27.5%	36.9%	32.1%	25.7%	-6.4%	29.2%
2.I		54.3%	51.2%	48.7%	51.9%	46.0%	-5.9%	50.7%
2.II		18.8%	18.7%	13.5%	14.9%	25.2%	10.3%	18.2%
3		1.8%	2.6%	0.9%	1.1%	3.1%	2.0%	1.9%
Total Classified Degrees		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%
1st and 2.I Class		79.4%	78.7%	85.6%	84.0%	71.7%	-12.3%	79.8%

Our classification ratio had been relatively stable throughout the period 2017/18 – 2020/21, with an increase in first class awards during 2019/20, which was covered by the University's Degree Outcomes Statement published in 2021. However, the level of 1st or 2:1 classification degrees fell for 2021/22 graduates.

Appendix A provides an extract from *Institutional Annual Quality Report 2021-22 (IAQR)* which includes data on degree classification outcomes and further analysis by Student Characteristic and by Faculty and School.

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 collaborative 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 Leeds

Trinity University (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 processes 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 and 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 School 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 collaborative 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 and are designed to ensure compliance with the OfS B Conditions of Registration for Quality and Standards) 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 that 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 *Taught Programme Academic Regulations (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 LTU 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

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

students who refer themselves to the service or who are referred to the service by their programme team. Our data for AY2021-22 shows that:

- From 1st September 2021 to 31st August 2022, the Learning Hub conducted a total of 2,067 student tutorials and delivered 188 workshops. This compares to a total of 2006 student tutorials (which in turn was an increase on 2019/20) and 45 workshops in AY2020/21.
 - The increase in workshops was due to the end of lockdown measures and the introduction of the Embedded Academic Skills Workshop Programme.
 - Around 8% of students at Level 4 engaged in one-on-one tutorials with the Learning Hub. A greater proportion of Level 5 (15%) and Level 6 (18%) students engaged with the service. This disparity was compensated for by the establishment of the embedded academic skills workshop programme mentioned above.
 - The pass rate of Level 4 students that engaged with the service (89%) was higher than those that did not (77%), and this higher pass rate can be seen across most minority and widening participation demographics.
 - Students that engaged with the Learning Hub during Level 6 achieved a slightly lower proportion of 1st/2:1-degree awards (69%) compared to students that did not engage with the Learning Hub during Level 6 (71%). This bucks the trend for Level 6 students using the Learning Hub historically.
 - Peer Support Champions returned to on-campus working in AY2021/22, with some online sessions as necessary. 243 visits or enquiries were fielded by the Peer Support Champions across 303 sessions. This is a substantial increase on the previous year due to the lifting of lockdown restrictions.
- 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

3.9 Award Outcomes by Graduation Year

3.9.1. 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.

3.9.2. The level of 1st or 2:1 classification degree has fallen to 71.7% for 21/22 graduates, this follows two years with very high levels above longer term trends. The proportion of PGCE students achieving a distinction has increased from last year, Masters level awards have decreased in terms of distinction classification.

Table 20: Award classification by programme type and graduation year

LTU Campus-Based Foundation Degrees	Graduating Year				
Measure	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22
Intended Awards Made	27	28	32	16	19
<i>Distinction Class</i>	29.6%	46.4%	53.1%	56.3%	36.8%
<i>Merit Class</i>	59.3%	50.0%	34.4%	31.3%	36.8%
<i>Pass Class</i>	11.1%	3.6%	12.5%	12.5%	26.3%
LTU Campus-Based Undergraduate Degrees	Graduating Year				
Measure	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22
Intended Awards Made	832	773	651	646	639
1st or 2:1 Class Degrees	79.4%	78.7%	85.6%	84.1%	71.7%
<i>1st Class Degrees</i>	25.1%	27.6%	36.9%	32.0%	25.7%
<i>2:1 Class Degrees</i>	54.3%	51.1%	48.7%	52.0%	46.0%
<i>2:2 Class Degrees</i>	18.8%	18.8%	13.5%	14.7%	25.2%
<i>3rd Class Degrees</i>	1.8%	2.6%	0.9%	1.1%	3.1%
LTU Campus-Based PGCE	Graduating Year				
Measure	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22
PGCE Awards Made (L6 or L7)	277	307	324	346	233
<i>PGCE (L7) Distinction Class</i>	22.4%	24.1%	22.2%	19.1%	24.9%
<i>PGCE (L7) Merit Class</i>	43.0%	46.9%	47.5%	42.2%	41.2%
<i>PGCE (L7) Pass Class</i>	25.3%	24.8%	29.0%	34.4%	27.5%
<i>PGCE (L6) Pass Class</i>	9.4%	4.2%	1.2%	4.3%	6.4%
LTU Campus-Based Taught Masters	Graduating Year				
Measure	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22
Intended Awards Made	79	70	81	101	120
<i>Distinction Class</i>	32.9%	35.7%	37.0%	39.6%	33.3%
<i>Merit Class</i>	43.0%	44.3%	50.6%	47.5%	49.2%
<i>Pass Class</i>	24.1%	20.0%	12.3%	12.9%	17.5%
Franchise Partnerships Taught Masters	Graduating Year				
Measure	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22
Intended Awards Made	0	0	0	10	12
<i>Distinction Class</i>	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.0%	0.0%
<i>Merit Class</i>	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.0%	33.3%
<i>Pass Class</i>	n/a	n/a	n/a	100.0%	66.7%

3.9.3. A first small cohort of LTU campus based students entering through foundation year reached graduation in 21/22. The proportion achieving a 1st or 2:1 classification is 52.6% which is some way short of the level achieved by students entering directly at level 4. However, this

is a small cohort who mostly entered through clearing and a more robust comparison is expected for 22/23 graduates which will feature the first larger scale foundation year cohort. At this stage, no UG franchise partnerships has reached graduation stage.

Table 21: 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)					
	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	+/- Yr on Yr
All Students	832	773	656	646	687	79.4%	78.7%	85.5%	84.1%	73.2%	-10.9%
LTU Campus-Based (All)	832	773	656	646	687	79.4%	78.7%	85.5%	84.1%	73.2%	-10.9%
LTU Campus UG Degree (L6 Top-Up)	37	34	38	38	24	94.6%	94.1%	92.1%	94.7%	100.0%	+5.3%
LTU Campus UG Degree (L4 Entry)	795	739	613	608	596	78.7%	77.9%	85.2%	83.4%	71.1%	-12.3%
LTU Campus UG Degree (With FY)	0	0	0	0	19	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	52.6%	
UK Franchise UG Degree (With FY)	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

3.9.4. The proportion of awards made with classification 1st or 2:1 varies between departments. ICE has seen the largest decline with both CYPF and Teacher Education reducing by over 18% (but from a previous very high level). Crime, Investigation and Policing has reduced by 21.7% and Psychology by 14.2%.

Table 22: Undergraduate degree 1st/2:1 award by Faculty/School and graduation year

Undergraduate Degree Awards	Awards Made (by Graduation Year)					1/2:1 Awards % (by Graduation Year)					
	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	+/- Yr on Yr
LTU Campus September Entry:											
Total LTU Campus September Entry	832	773	651	646	639	79.4%	78.7%	85.6%	84.1%	71.7%	-12.4%
ICE	343	279	257	187	202	84.5%	83.2%	90.7%	94.7%	76.2%	-18.5%
SCBL	244	243	150	189	148	81.6%	80.7%	88.0%	88.4%	81.8%	-6.6%
SSHS	245	251	244	270	289	70.2%	71.7%	78.7%	73.7%	63.3%	-10.4%
LTU Campus September Entry:											
Total LTU Campus September Entry	832	773	651	646	639	79.4%	78.7%	85.6%	84.1%	71.7%	-12.4%
ICE Children, Young People & Families	204	164	152	105	95	79.9%	79.3%	84.9%	93.3%	74.7%	-18.6%
ICE Teacher Education	139	115	105	82	107	91.4%	88.7%	99.0%	96.3%	77.6%	-18.7%
BCDI Business	65	64	40	56	41	87.7%	82.8%	92.5%	83.9%	82.9%	-1.0%
BCDI Computing	0	0	0	5	5	n/a	n/a	n/a	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%
BCDI Digital and Screen Media	179	179	110	128	102	79.3%	79.9%	86.4%	89.8%	80.4%	-9.4%
SHS Crime, Investigation and Policing	0	36	40	43	67	n/a	72.2%	72.5%	81.4%	59.7%	-21.7%
SHS Psychology and Therapeutic Studies	119	131	106	135	137	81.5%	74.0%	82.1%	77.0%	62.8%	-14.2%
SHS Sport and Wellbeing	126	84	98	82	68	59.5%	67.9%	77.6%	61.0%	64.7%	+3.7%

3.10 Performance by Student Characteristics and Attainment Gaps

3.10.1. 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 21/22 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

3.10.2. In respect of entry qualifications and entry route persistent attainment gaps have been observed for a number of years for students entering through clearing, with mainly BTEC qualifications and low entry tariffs. 21/22 performance highlights that the gap for clearing entrants has increased further relative to main cycle entrants at foundation year and level 4. The gap between BTEC and A-Level entrants still persists at every stage of the lifecycle. There has been progress for low tariff entrants at foundation year in 21/22 but this remains a challenge at other levels of study.

Table 23a: Progression rates and 1st/2:1 degree award 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	
		21/22	3 Year	21/22	3 Year	21/22	3 Year	21/22	3 Year
All	All	55.0%	59.8%	74.2%	78.4%	82.6%	86.4%	73.2%	80.8%
Application Type	Clearing	40.6%	45.9%	64.9%	71.2%	80.2%	82.1%	74.3%	79.7%
	Main Cycle	61.6%	66.4%	76.0%	79.7%	83.0%	87.1%	73.1%	80.9%
Entry Qualification Type	BTEC	50.8%	52.5%	68.9%	72.6%	76.3%	80.9%	60.6%	71.2%
	A-Level	56.7%	64.1%	78.0%	81.5%	87.1%	90.5%	78.8%	85.7%
	Other	57.7%	63.4%	73.9%	79.2%	81.6%	84.2%	73.1%	80.5%
Entry Tariff (UCAS Points)	No UCAS Points Recorded	52.5%	62.3%	72.4%	76.2%	77.8%	83.8%	80.0%	84.4%
	Low UCAS Points	58.2%	55.5%	70.2%	74.8%	75.3%	80.7%	63.0%	73.8%
	Higher UCAS Points	54.7%	60.8%	76.4%	80.4%	85.9%	89.0%	76.1%	82.8%

Table 23b: Attainment gaps by student characteristic

Student Characteristic Comparison	FY-L4 Progression		L4-L5 Progression		L5-L6 Progression		1st/2:1 Awards	
	21/22	3 Year	21/22	3 Year	21/22	3 Year	21/22	3 Year
Clearing v Main Cycle Application	-21.0%	-20.5%	-11.1%	-8.5%	-2.8%	-5.0%	+1.2%	-1.2%
BTEC Quals v A-Level	-5.9%	-11.6%	-9.1%	-8.9%	-10.8%	-9.6%	-18.2%	-14.5%
Other Quals v A-Level	+1.0%	-0.7%	-4.1%	-2.3%	-5.5%	-6.3%	-5.7%	-5.2%
No UCAS Points v High UCAS Points	-2.2%	+1.5%	-4.0%	-4.2%	-8.1%	-5.2%	+3.9%	+1.6%
Low UCAS Points v High UCAS Points	+3.5%	-5.3%	-6.2%	-5.6%	-10.6%	-8.3%	-13.1%	-9.0%

3.10.3. 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 foundation year and for 1st or 2:1 award in particular for 21/22. The gap has closed at levels 4 and 5. However, this is reflecting a significant reduction in the performance of white students, and this therefore remains an area of high importance to continue working towards the elimination of gaps. A gap is still present on a three year average at each level.

3.10.4. Male students also have much lower performance compared to female students at every level with larger gaps in 21/22 at most levels compared to the 3 year average. The proportion of male students varies across departments (only 19.1% of new entrants at level 4 in Teacher Education were male compared to 66.9% of Sport and Wellbeing new entrants). However, the attainment gaps by gender exist in almost all schools.

3.10.5. Mature students do not have any attainment gap at any level of study in 21/22 compared to young students. Mature entrants to the foundation year continue to perform strongly compared to young entrants. A gap is present at levels 4 and 5 for students with a disability or learning difficulty.

Table 24a: Progression rates and 1st/2:1 degree award 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	
		21/22	3 Year	21/22	3 Year	21/22	3 Year	21/22	3 Year
All	All	55.0%	59.8%	74.2%	78.4%	82.6%	86.4%	73.2%	80.8%
Age	Mature (Age 21+)	62.8%	65.4%	72.1%	78.9%	82.6%	83.9%	83.2%	84.7%
	Young (Age Under 21)	52.0%	57.9%	74.7%	78.3%	82.6%	86.9%	69.8%	79.7%
Disability	Disability/Learning Difficulty	63.0%	67.2%	70.4%	78.5%	78.7%	81.4%	74.1%	79.3%
	No Disability	52.7%	57.8%	75.1%	78.3%	83.9%	87.8%	72.8%	81.1%
Ethnicity	Asian, Black, Mixed, Other	49.3%	53.9%	75.1%	77.5%	84.1%	84.1%	63.0%	72.7%
	White	59.4%	64.1%	73.9%	78.8%	82.2%	87.1%	76.3%	82.9%
Ethnicity (Detailed)	Asian	53.2%	56.8%	74.3%	79.8%	87.8%	87.1%	63.3%	72.7%
	Black	51.5%	48.9%	75.6%	73.9%	70.0%	73.8%	47.1%	60.0%
	Mixed	42.3%	54.8%	74.4%	74.0%	86.2%	84.9%	71.4%	79.5%
	Other	25.0%	45.5%	82.4%	74.1%	50.0%	72.7%	66.7%	85.7%
	White	59.4%	64.1%	73.9%	78.8%	82.2%	87.1%	76.3%	82.9%
Gender	Male	48.6%	54.8%	68.9%	72.0%	76.1%	83.4%	69.6%	76.0%
	Female	62.1%	65.5%	77.5%	81.7%	85.4%	87.8%	74.7%	83.1%
Accommodation	Off Campus	56.1%	58.5%	73.8%	77.2%	82.6%	85.8%	74.6%	81.0%
	On Campus	53.3%	62.7%	75.0%	80.0%	82.6%	87.0%	69.1%	80.0%

Table 24b: Attainment gaps by student characteristic

Student Characteristic Comparison	FY-L4 Progression		L4-L5 Progression		L5-L6 Progression		1st/2:1 Awards	
	21/22	3 Year	21/22	3 Year	21/22	3 Year	21/22	3 Year
Mature v Young	+10.8%	+7.5%	-2.6%	+0.6%	0.0%	-3.0%	+13.4%	+5.0%
Disability/Learning Difficulty v No Disability	+10.3%	+9.4%	-4.7%	+0.2%	-5.2%	-6.4%	+1.3%	-1.8%
Asian, Black, Mixed, Other v White	-10.1%	-10.2%	+1.2%	-1.3%	+1.9%	-3.0%	-13.3%	-10.2%
Asian v White	-6.2%	-7.3%	+0.4%	+1.0%	+5.6%	0.0%	-13.0%	-10.2%
Black v White	-7.9%	-15.2%	+1.7%	-4.9%	-12.2%	-13.3%	-29.2%	-22.9%
Mixed v White	-17.1%	-9.3%	+0.5%	-4.8%	+4.0%	-2.2%	-4.9%	-3.4%
Other v White	-34.4%	-18.6%	+8.5%	-4.7%	-32.2%	-14.4%	-9.6%	+2.8%
Male v Female	-13.5%	-10.7%	-8.6%	-9.7%	-9.3%	-4.4%	-5.1%	-7.1%
Off Campus v On Campus	+2.8%	-4.2%	-1.2%	-2.8%	0.0%	-1.2%	+5.5%	+1.0%

3.10.6. The tables below contain a range of student attributes showing the background of students. Performance is slightly lower for students with parents/guardians that do not have a higher education qualification, particularly at foundation year and level 4.

3.10.7. HE Participation (POLAR) is a UK wide classification of small areas based on the participation rate of young people in Higher Education. The 2-way split classifies Quintile 1 and 2 as low participation. Students from areas with the lowest participation in HE (POLAR Quintile 1) has relatively low performance at level 5 and in terms of final degree outcome.

3.10.8. The Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) is the government measure of relative deprivation for postcodes in England. The IMD score is based on a range of social and economic measures such as income, employment, education, health, and crime. The 2-way split classifies Quintile 1 and 2 as high deprivation. Students from the most deprived areas (IMD Quintile 1) have relatively low performance and in general the performance of students in Quintile 4-5 is highest.

Table 25a: 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	
		21/22	3 Year	21/22	3 Year	21/22	3 Year	21/22	3 Year
All	All	55.0%	59.8%	74.2%	78.4%	82.6%	86.4%	73.2%	80.8%
Parental Education	No Higher Education	95.1%	51.8%	84.3%	73.4%	9.7%	87.0%	74.6%	81.8%
	Higher Education	98.0%	55.5%	84.8%	78.9%	21.1%	88.9%	71.1%	80.4%
HE Participation (POLAR) 2-Way	Low Participation	57.7%	59.6%	73.6%	76.6%	82.5%	86.2%	69.9%	79.5%
	Higher Participation	52.3%	59.9%	74.5%	79.5%	83.5%	86.9%	76.3%	82.0%
HE Participation (POLAR) Detail	Quintile 1 - Lowest	54.8%	56.6%	74.9%	76.5%	75.9%	83.0%	72.4%	78.0%
	Quintile 2	60.2%	62.5%	72.3%	76.6%	87.4%	88.6%	68.0%	80.7%
	Quintile 3	48.7%	57.2%	74.3%	78.1%	85.5%	88.3%	80.6%	85.3%
	Quintile 4	57.4%	66.9%	76.1%	80.9%	79.4%	84.2%	74.6%	80.2%
	Quintile 5 - Highest	52.5%	55.2%	72.7%	80.1%	85.1%	88.0%	72.8%	79.0%
Deprivation (IMD) 2-Way	High Deprivation	50.8%	57.7%	72.2%	76.3%	80.9%	85.0%	69.8%	79.1%
	Lower Deprivation	59.4%	61.9%	76.9%	80.6%	85.3%	88.0%	76.4%	82.6%
Deprivation (IMD) Detail	Quintile 1 - Highest	50.4%	56.9%	70.9%	75.2%	82.8%	84.2%	67.8%	77.1%
	Quintile 2	52.1%	59.8%	74.8%	78.2%	77.5%	86.1%	72.3%	81.5%
	Quintile 3	54.5%	58.5%	76.2%	77.4%	86.6%	86.6%	75.9%	79.6%
	Quintile 4	66.0%	69.1%	76.1%	81.4%	82.3%	88.6%	77.1%	82.9%
	Quintile 5 - Lowest	58.3%	53.8%	78.8%	83.7%	88.0%	89.1%	76.3%	85.7%

Table 25b: Attainment gaps by student characteristic

Student Characteristic Comparison	FY-L4 Progression		L4-L5 Progression		L5-L6 Progression		1st/2:1 Awards	
	21/22	3 Year	21/22	3 Year	21/22	3 Year	21/22	3 Year
No Parental HE v Parental HE	-2.9%	-3.7%	-0.5%	-5.5%	-11.4%	-1.9%	+3.5%	+1.4%
POLAR Low v Higher Participation	+5.4%	-0.3%	-0.9%	-2.9%	-1.0%	-0.7%	-6.4%	-2.5%
POLAR Quintile 1 v Higher Participation (Q3-5)	+2.5%	-3.3%	+0.4%	-3.0%	-7.6%	-3.9%	-3.9%	-4.0%
POLAR Quintile 2 v Higher Participation (Q3-5)	+7.9%	+2.6%	-2.2%	-2.9%	+3.9%	+1.7%	-8.3%	-1.3%
POLAR Quintile 3 v Higher Participation (Q3-5)	-3.6%	-2.7%	-0.2%	-1.4%	+2.0%	+1.4%	+4.3%	+3.3%
POLAR Quintile 4 v Higher Participation (Q3-5)	+5.1%	+7.0%	+1.6%	+1.4%	-4.1%	-2.7%	-1.7%	-1.8%
POLAR Quintile 5 v Higher Participation (Q3-5)	+0.2%	-4.7%	-1.8%	+0.6%	+1.6%	+1.1%	-3.5%	-3.0%
IMD High Deprivation v Lower Deprivation	-8.6%	-4.2%	-4.7%	-4.3%	-4.4%	-3.0%	-6.6%	-3.5%
IMD Quintile 1 v Lower Deprivation (Q3-5)	-9.0%	-5.0%	-6.0%	-5.4%	-2.5%	-3.8%	-8.6%	-5.5%
IMD Quintile 2 v Lower Deprivation (Q3-5)	-7.3%	-2.1%	-2.1%	-2.4%	-7.8%	-1.9%	-4.1%	-1.1%
IMD Quintile 3 v Lower Deprivation (Q3-5)	-4.9%	-3.4%	-0.7%	-3.2%	+1.3%	-1.4%	-0.5%	-3.0%
IMD Quintile 4 v Lower Deprivation (Q3-5)	+6.6%	+7.2%	-0.8%	+0.8%	-3.0%	+0.6%	+0.7%	+0.3%
IMD Quintile 5 v Lower Deprivation (Q3-5)	-1.1%	-8.1%	+1.9%	+3.1%	+2.7%	+1.1%	-0.1%	+3.1%

Actions

The following actions, which underpinned the content of the **2020 and 2021 Degree Outcomes Statements**, are now complete:

- Migration of undergraduate provision into a 30-credit framework structure by the end of the 2022-23
- Monitoring the application of the incremental roll-out of categorical marking system

The following additional action, which underpinned the content of the **2021 and 2022 Degree Outcomes Statements**, continue to progress:

- To review the operation of Assessment Panels and Progression and Award Boards for 2024-25 to ensure the appropriate targeted support for students and improving reporting as an output from Panels and Boards.

The following additional action, which underpins the context of the **2022 Degree Outcomes Statement**, will progress throughout the 2023-24 academic year:

- To review the Taught Programme Academic Regulations, including the University's algorithms for the calculation of degree classifications for 2024-25 to ensure they remain appropriate for the University's diversifying student body and growing academic portfolio of provision.