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The purpose of this Statement is to articulate how the University of Chichester meets the expectation that “The value of qualifications awarded to students at the point of qualification and over time is in line with sector-recognised standards”. The principal authority rests with the Academic Board, with operational implementation overseen by the Education Committee, primarily through its oversight of the programme approval and annual monitoring procedures, and through oversight of external examiners’ reports.

Prior to this Degree Outcomes Statement being considered by the Board of Governors, it was reviewed by the Education Committee, and the Academic Board.

# Update on actions (2020/21)

* Annual monitoring will focus on final awards and attainment for students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds and from black and ethnic minorities; to this end, we have sought to reduce the volume of formal examinations within the curriculum, and has halved the number of formal examination weeks from four during the academic year to just two. We recognised research published which noted that the gap all but disappears for coursework grades. UCL found that the difference was derived largely from marks awarded for examinations, where there was a 13% gap between white first- and second-year white students and their black/ethnic minority peers, rising to nearly 17% for the third-year cohort. Conversely, the gap in coursework grades was just 1 to 2 % among first- and second-years, and 5% for final-year students. We will continue to review this to ascertain the impact of the reduction of formal examinations.
* The University is seeking to develop an internal teaching awards scheme as a precursor to enabling applications to the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme. We launched the Vice-Chancellor’s Teaching Excellence Awards scheme in December 2022.

# Teaching practices and learning resources

The University of Chichester has invested heavily in the quality of teaching, continuing to situate the student learning experience and wellbeing at the heart of what we see as a transformational educational and personal journey. The following will have had a positive impact on improving student attainment:

* Our ongoing commitment to continuing professional development for academic and professional services staff, with an increased number of HEA Fellows at the University. In 2020, the University had 131, including a Principal Fellow and 13 Senior Fellows. By 2021 the University had 49 Associate Fellows, 145 Fellows, 16 Senior Fellows, and one Principal Fellow (totaling 211). 2022 saw a slight decrease with 46 Associate Fellows, 116 Fellows, 17 Senior Fellows and one Principal Fellow (totaling 180).
* There is a positive relationship between university spending on staff and student facilities and upper degrees, with both variables increasing over time – in the last year, the University has invested over £1m in latest generation technologies, including, for example, in the latest and most powerful WiFi to bring BOC up to the same high standard as that at BRC. WiFi has been improved at the Stockbridge accommodation. There has been investment in increased gigabit internet access that serves both campuses, and investment in next generation security tools to minimise risks to our students, staff and other stakeholders’ privacy. Over 40 classrooms have had new high definition AV bought and installed, and there has been investment in the high-performance computer room in the BRC LRC, which in addition to specialised teaching, gives extended opening hours to, for example, open access, CAD and eGaming. The University has invested in a new immersive suite (projection of static and moving scenes to walls and floor, wind machine, and even artificially created smells), and in Virtual and Augmented reality headsets to add to and enrich in-class and remote learnin,g as well as to enable innovative research through 3D visualisation. We have also made significant investment in Nursing through expenditure of £1.6m on HealthOne, and in Sport, £1.2m on the SportsDome. There is continuing investment in the Tudor Hale Sports Building through a phased refurbishment plan to enhance facilities. Stage and Screen programmes have benfited from £130k investment to enhance facilities. We are also continuing grounds and heritage investment including the refurbishment of the 200-year-old Grade 2 listed ‘Serpentine Wall’, with ongoing support for an adjacent heritage garden area.
* Teaching quality is evidenced by the Complete University Guide: Student satisfaction is high at Chichester, according to the Guide, ranking in the top ten; Chichester's teaching quality and student experience both rank in the top 30, according to the Times and Sunday Times Good University Guide 2023; University of Chichester is among the top-40 UK universities (Guardian University Guide 2023); Times and Sunday Times Good University Guide (2023) - Chichester is 29th for student experience.

# Assessment and marking practices

Assessment strategies take account of the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications, the relevant subject benchmark statements, and the appropriate elements of the UK Quality Code for HE (Quality Code). The following will have had a positive impact on improving student attainment:

Approvals panels are guided to comment upon intended learning outcomes, whether assessment tasks enable students to demonstrate achievement of the intended learning outcomes, and whether assessment criteria enable tutors to discern whether the outcomes have been achieved. The University then uses grading criteria to identify how well a student has achieved those outcomes.

The University’s Education Committee’s standing item for Supporting Student Success has addressed:

* Academic Misconduct Penalties
* Inclusive Education
* Education for Sustainable Development
* Teaching Excellence Awards
* OfS Blended Learning Review
* Cost of Living
* Building Resilience in the Curriculum Educational Gain

# Academic governance

The University’s Academic Board has responsibility for assuring the value of awards over time, including those delivered in partnership with others. To do this it receives an annual report on the outcome of the University’s quality assessment activities, evidences how we are continuing to meet our conditions of registration. The following will have had a positive impact on improving student attainment:

* In their annual report on the quality and standards of programmes, external examiners are asked to check and comment upon the standards of the qualification and of student performance is comparable with national frameworks and with the standards of similar programmes in other UK higher education institutions.
* External advisers are also employed as a key member of the University’s programme approval and periodic review process that considers and advises upon the academic standards of education provision, and enhancements to curricula and the student academic experience.
* In regard to partnerships, the University’s link tutors work closely with each academic partner on their marking practices, and moderate a sample of work. The outcomes of this moderation exercise are reported to the Academic Partnerships Forum.

# Classification algorithms

The algorithm for all undergraduate students is based upon a 40/60 weighting (i.e. the second year/Level 5 provides 40% of the outcome, and the third year/Level 6, 60% of the outcome). The higher weighting reflects the notion that as students progress through their programme of study it becomes more challenging and difficult. Similarly, we do not weight the first year of study – as a University with a remit for widening participation, we focus on a transition to higher education during this year. All marks are included in the calculation from Level 5 and Level 6. There is an automatic uplift rule for students the very edge of the boundary of the classification (for example, a student with 69.6% will have their mark rounded up to 70% for a First).

# Identifying good practice and actions

We currently have over 30 programmes of study recognised by PSRBs, including The BSc (Hons Physiotherapy recognised by Health and Care Professions Council and the Chartered Society of Physiotherapy; BSc (Hons) Psychology recognised by the British Psychological Society, BA (Hons) Social Work (Social Work England); BA (Hons) Sport Management (Chartered Institute for the Management of Sport and Physical Activity (CIMSPA)); BSc (Hons) Sport and Exercise Science (British Association of Sport Exercise Sciences (BASES)); BSc (Hons) Mathematics (Institute of Mathematics and its Applications); BA (Hons) Humanistic Counselling (British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy (BACP)); LLB (Hons) law (Solicitors’ Regulatory Authority (SRA) and Bar Standards Board (BSB)); and English language provision (British Council).

Psychology set up the Peer Assisted Learning (PAL) initiative. PAL is a form of collaborative learning that has been implemented in a variety of universities with good success[[1]](#endnote-1). A core feature of PAL is that it is run and led by students for their peers.  PAL has been developed and embedded in a wide range of modules, but seems particularly appropriate in the context of service modules (e.g. mathematics taught to non-specialists, such as Psychology and Criminology students).

The Director of Quality and Standards contributes to national debates, including to the work of the UK Standing Committee for Quality Assessment, and was a member of the QAA’s Expert Advisory Group on external examining, enabling the University to contribute to national policy and practice in the area of academic standards.

Martine McDonagh is a Royal Literary Fund Fellow at the university. She is a professional author sponsored by the RLF to offer one-to-one help with any aspect of students’ writing skills to make their writing as clear and effective as possible. For example, for new students who need help to interpret an assignment brief or with planning and structuring an essay or dissertation, or have any writing-related problem, she can help. Martine can also help more seasoned learners looking to improve their writing and editorial skills. Sessions are entirely free of charge, confidential and independent of the university.

Our Professional Development Programme includes a section focussed on Enhancing the Student Experience: Learning and Teaching offering sessions on Engaging Learners, Learning Through Failure, Digital Accessibility (Designing out Barriers to Learning), Student Engagement Tools, Blended and Flipped Learning, Engaging Students in Blended Learning.

# Actions for 2022/23

To monitor the Vice-Chancellor’s Awards scheme and its impact and successful nominations to the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme;

To review the ‘MAF’ (module assessment feedback), and associated assessment practices;

To monitor the impact of the reduction of formal examinations specifically on the attainment of black and ethnic minority students

# Risks and challenges

This is the fourth annual iteration of our Degree Outcomes Statement, and it will be reviewed and refreshed annually as we continue to investigate an extraordinarily complex area.

Katie Akerman MA (Exon) PgCert Dip.Q FAUA PFHEA FRSA Director of Quality and Standards

# Institutional degree classification profile

Universities in England have [committed](https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/what-we-do/policy-and-research/publications/after-pandemic-our-commitment-degree) to reversing pandemic grade inflation in first and 2.1 degrees. In a first of its kind statement Universities UK (UUK) and GuildHE members have committed to return to pre-pandemic levels of ‘upper’ degree classification by 2023.

Measures to ensure students were not unfairly disadvantaged during the unique circumstances of the pandemic contributed to increases in the proportion of first and 2.1 undergraduate degree awards.

The statement recognises that grade inflation which cannot be explained by the developments in teaching and learning that combined with students’ hard work to improve results in the prior decade, risk undermining student, employer and public confidence in the system.

Universities will take the pre-pandemic year of 2019 as a benchmark for the commitment, when proactive action by universities to protect the value of degrees was leading to a levelling-off in the percentage of students achieving upper degree awards.

Data from the Office for Students indicates that for the University overall:

Percentage of Firsts/2:1s

**2021/22 76.6**

2020/21 81.9

2019/20 82.6

**2018/19 76.2**

2017/18 74.9

2016/17 71.1

For the Business School, 61.1% of students gained a First or 2:1, compared to 71% in the previous year.

For the Conservatoire, 89.6% of students gained a First or 2:1, compared with 92.1% of students in the previous year.

For Creative Industries, 81.5% of students gained a First or 2:1, compared with 96.8% of students in the previous year.

For Arts and Humanities, 83.9% of students were awarded a First or 2:1; compared with 86% for the previous year.

For Education, Life and Social Sciences, 81.8% of students were awarded a First or 2:1; compared with 85.7% for the previous year.

For Engineering, 77.4% of students gained a First or 2:1; compared with 64.3% for the previous year.

For the Institute of Sport, Nursing and Allied Health 59.7% of students were awarded a First or 2:1; compared with 58.2% for the previous year.

Institutes have been asked to comment upon changes in graduate attainment in their annual monitoring reporting.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Institutional classification profile | | **Year** | **2017/18** | **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** | **2021/22** |
| **Subject Area** | **Grouping** | **Value** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **#** |
| **Business School** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Age | Under 21 | 61.6% | 53 | 67.4% | 32 | 69.4% | 43 | 80.0% | 48 | 59.5% | 25 |
|  | Age | 21-24 | 45.5% | 10 | 70.0% | 7 | 35.3% | 6 | 58.9% | 33 | 46.7% | 14 |
|  | Age | 25-29 | 100.0% | 4 | 100.0% | 2 | 0.0% | 0 | 50.0% | 1 | 66.7% | 2 |
|  | Age | 30-39 | - | 0 | 100.0% | 2 | 100.0% | 1 | 100.0% | 4 | 80.0% | 4 |
|  | Age | 40-49 | 100.0% | 1 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 100.0% | 1 | 100.0% | 7 |
|  | Age | 50+ | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
|  | Disability | Not Disabled | 61.2% | 63 | 69.7% | 38 | 66.2% | 45 | 70.9% | 78 | 59.8% | 49 |
|  | Disability | Dyslexic | 33.3% | 2 | 66.7% | 2 | 37.5% | 3 | 33.3% | 1 | 75.0% | 3 |
|  | Disability | Other Disability | 75.0% | 3 | 75.0% | 3 | 40.0% | 2 | 81.8% | 9 | 75.0% | 3 |
|  | Ethnicity | BAME | 38.1% | 16 | 50.0% | 8 | 55.6% | 15 | 60.0% | 30 | 36.4% | 4 |
|  | Ethnicity | White | 72.9% | 51 | 77.3% | 34 | 66.0% | 35 | 82.3% | 51 | 85.7% | 42 |
|  | Ethnicity | Unknown | 100.0% | 1 | 66.7% | 1 | 0.0% | 0 | 58.3% | 7 | 30.0% | 9 |
|  | Gender | Male | 42.3% | 22 | 54.2% | 16 | 46.9% | 23 | 65.8% | 50 | 50.8% | 30 |
|  | Gender | Female | 75.4% | 46 | 84.4% | 27 | 84.4% | 27 | 79.2% | 38 | 80.6% | 25 |
|  | Tariff | - | 47.2% | 17 | 64.9% | 12 | 58.3% | 14 | 69.2% | 45 | 48.9% | 23 |
|  | Tariff | 000-047 | 100.0% | 2 | - | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 100.0% | 3 |
|  | Tariff | 048-095 | 54.8% | 17 | 60.0% | 9 | 69.2% | 9 | 73.7% | 14 | 64.3% | 9 |
|  | Tariff | 096-143 | 66.7% | 18 | 73.3% | 11 | 69.0% | 20 | 78.3% | 18 | 77.8% | 14 |
|  | Tariff | 144-191 | 78.6% | 11 | 83.3% | 10 | 45.5% | 5 | 64.3% | 9 | 75.0% | 6 |
|  | Tariff | 192-239 | 100.0% | 3 | 100.0% | 1 | 100.0% | 2 | 100.0% | 2 | - | 0 |
|  | Tariff | 240-287 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
|  | Tariff | 288-335 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| **Conservatoire** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Age | Under 21 | 83.6% | 247 | 87.3% | 258 | 91.0% | 213 | 92.5% | 245 | 88.7% | 252 |
|  | Age | 21-24 | 71.4% | 5 | 87.8% | 18 | 91.3% | 21 | 87.0% | 20 | 100.0% | 16 |
|  | Age | 25-29 | 60.0% | 2 | 100.0% | 2 | - | 0 | 100.0% | 1 | 100.0% | 5 |
|  | Age | 30-39 | 50.0% | 1 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 100.0% | 1 | 100.0% | 2 |
|  | Age | 40-49 | - | 0 | 100.0% | 1 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 100.0% | 1 |
|  | Age | 50+ | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
|  | Disability | Not Disabled | 83.8% | 204 | 88.7% | 225 | 92.5% | 186 | 93.5% | 201 | 91.9% | 217 |
|  | Disability | Dyslexic | 76.7% | 33 | 78.4% | 20 | 86.4% | 19 | 86.7% | 26 | 77.4% | 24 |
|  | Disability | Other Disability | 86.4% | 19 | 85.2% | 35 | 85.3% | 29 | 89.1% | 41 | 85.4% | 35 |
|  | Ethnicity | BAME | 81.8% | 23 | 83.7% | 21 | 80.0% | 16 | 85.0% | 17 | 81.3% | 13 |
|  | Ethnicity | White | 83.1% | 234 | 87.6% | 255 | 91.9% | 217 | 92.5% | 245 | 89.9% | 250 |
|  | Ethnicity | Unknown | - | 0 | 100.0% | 4 | 100.0% | 1 | 100.0% | 6 | 92.9% | 13 |
|  | Gender | Male | 76.6% | 48 | 85.3% | 58 | 92.9% | 39 | 89.7% | 61 | 75.9% | 44 |
|  | Gender | Female | 84.6% | 209 | 88.0% | 221 | 90.7% | 195 | 92.8% | 207 | 92.8% | 232 |
|  | Tariff | - | 80.0% | 8 | 85.7% | 15 | 90.0% | 18 | 92.0% | 23 | 100.0% | 10 |
|  | Tariff | 000-047 | 100.0% | 2 | 100.0% | 3 | 80.0% | 4 | 100.0% | 1 | 75.0% | 3 |
|  | Tariff | 048-095 | 72.2% | 26 | 76.3% | 23 | 76.0% | 19 | 83.3% | 30 | 74.3% | 26 |
|  | Tariff | 096-143 | 77.7% | 89 | 85.0% | 117 | 91.0% | 91 | 89.8% | 106 | 88.0% | 110 |
|  | Tariff | 144-191 | 89.3% | 108 | 90.9% | 90 | 94.2% | 81 | 96.8% | 90 | 93.7% | 104 |
|  | Tariff | 192-239 | 100.0% | 20 | 96.6% | 28 | 100.0% | 19 | 100.0% | 16 | 100.0% | 19 |
|  | Tariff | 240-287 | 60.0% | 3 | 100.0% | 4 | 100.0% | 2 | 100.0% | 2 | 100.0% | 3 |
|  | Tariff | 288-335 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| **Creative Industries** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Age | Under 21 | 90.1% | 32 | 84.3% | 30 | 98.1% | 51 | 97.9% | 46 | 79.4% | 75 |
|  | Age | 21-24 | - | 0 | 80.0% | 2 | 100.0% | 4 | 91.7% | 11 | 90.9% | 10 |
|  | Age | 25-29 | 100.0% | 1 | 100.0% | 1 | 66.7% | 1 | 100.0% | 1 | 66.7% | 2 |
|  | Age | 30-39 | 100.0% | 1 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 100.0% | 1 | 100.0% | 2 |
|  | Age | 40-49 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
|  | Age | 50+ | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
|  | Disability | Not Disabled | 88.5% | 27 | 87.5% | 25 | 94.0% | 39 | 98.0% | 48 | 81.0% | 68 |
|  | Disability | Dyslexic | 100.0% | 4 | 57.1% | 2 | 100.0% | 10 | 100.0% | 2 | 80.6% | 15 |
|  | Disability | Other Disability | 100.0% | 2 | 85.7% | 6 | 100.0% | 7 | 90.9% | 10 | 86.2% | 13 |
|  | Ethnicity | BAME | 55.6% | 3 | 60.0% | 2 | 80.0% | 4 | 85.7% | 6 | 71.4% | 5 |
|  | Ethnicity | White | 95.3% | 31 | 86.1% | 31 | 97.1% | 51 | 98.1% | 52 | 83.4% | 88 |
|  | Ethnicity | Unknown | - | 0 | - | 0 | 100.0% | 1 | 100.0% | 2 | 50.0% | 2 |
|  | Gender | Male | 81.1% | 15 | 83.3% | 20 | 94.3% | 33 | 97.6% | 40 | 83.0% | 61 |
|  | Gender | Female | 100.0% | 18 | 86.2% | 13 | 97.9% | 23 | 95.2% | 20 | 79.1% | 34 |
|  | Tariff | - | - | 0 | 85.7% | 3 | 57.1% | 2 | 66.7% | 2 | 77.8% | 7 |
|  | Tariff | 000-047 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 100.0% | 2 | 100.0% | 1 | 100.0% | 2 |
|  | Tariff | 048-095 | 82.6% | 10 | 86.7% | 7 | 100.0% | 13 | 94.1% | 16 | 85.1% | 29 |
|  | Tariff | 096-143 | 91.7% | 17 | 76.9% | 15 | 96.2% | 25 | 100.0% | 27 | 79.1% | 36 |
|  | Tariff | 144-191 | 100.0% | 5 | 100.0% | 6 | 100.0% | 13 | 100.0% | 13 | 87.2% | 21 |
|  | Tariff | 192-239 | 100.0% | 2 | 100.0% | 2 | 100.0% | 1 | 100.0% | 1 | 50.0% | 1 |
|  | Tariff | 240-287 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0% | 0 |
|  | Tariff | 288-335 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| **Department of Engineering, Computing and Design** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Age | Under 21 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 69.2% | 9 | 66.7% | 12 |
|  | Age | 21-24 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 88.9% | 8 |
|  | Age | 25-29 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 100.0% | 3 |
|  | Age | 30-39 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 100.0% | 1 |
|  | Age | 40-49 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
|  | Age | 50+ | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
|  | Disability | Not Disabled | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 54.5% | 6 | 76.0% | 19 |
|  | Disability | Dyslexic | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 100.0% | 2 | 80.0% | 4 |
|  | Disability | Other Disability | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 100.0% | 1 | 100.0% | 1 |
|  | Ethnicity | BAME | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 66.7% | 2 |
|  | Ethnicity | White | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 69.2% | 9 | 77.8% | 21 |
|  | Ethnicity | Unknown | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 100.0% | 1 |
|  | Gender | Male | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 61.5% | 8 | 74.1% | 20 |
|  | Gender | Female | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 100.0% | 1 | 100.0% | 4 |
|  | Tariff | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 100.0% | 8 |
|  | Tariff | 000-047 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 100.0% | 1 | - | 0 |
|  | Tariff | 048-095 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 50.0% | 3 | 54.5% | 6 |
|  | Tariff | 096-143 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 83.3% | 5 | 87.5% | 7 |
|  | Tariff | 144-191 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 50.0% | 1 |
|  | Tariff | 192-239 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 100.0% | 2 |
|  | Tariff | 240-287 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
|  | Tariff | 288-335 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| **Institute of Arts & Humanities** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Age | Under 21 | 78.8% | 119 | 81.1% | 183 | 87.9% | 123 | 85.9% | 110 | 85.1% | 106 |
|  | Age | 21-24 | 84.6% | 11 | 69.2% | 9 | 90.0% | 9 | 81.8% | 9 | 71.4% | 5 |
|  | Age | 25-29 | 80.0% | 4 | 50.0% | 1 | 57.1% | 2 | 75.0% | 3 | 100.0% | 2 |
|  | Age | 30-39 | 100.0% | 4 | 85.7% | 6 | 100.0% | 2 | 80.0% | 4 | 100.0% | 1 |
|  | Age | 40-49 | 80.0% | 4 | 100.0% | 3 | 100.0% | 5 | 100.0% | 2 | 100.0% | 1 |
|  | Age | 50+ | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
|  | Disability | Not Disabled | 80.4% | 119 | 81.0% | 156 | 91.7% | 94 | 88.2% | 97 | 84.9% | 73 |
|  | Disability | Dyslexic | 80.0% | 12 | 72.7% | 16 | 68.2% | 15 | 76.9% | 10 | 79.4% | 14 |
|  | Disability | Other Disability | 78.3% | 18 | 81.6% | 36 | 90.0% | 36 | 82.4% | 28 | 83.6% | 31 |
|  | Ethnicity | BAME | 77.8% | 7 | 83.3% | 10 | 77.8% | 7 | 75.0% | 6 | 71.4% | 5 |
|  | Ethnicity | White | 79.9% | 139 | 80.2% | 195 | 88.7% | 137 | 86.3% | 126 | 84.3% | 110 |
|  | Ethnicity | Unknown | 100.0% | 3 | 85.7% | 3 | 100.0% | 1 | 100.0% | 3 | 100.0% | 2 |
|  | Gender | Male | 72.8% | 54 | 80.0% | 82 | 87.0% | 47 | 87.5% | 42 | 81.9% | 34 |
|  | Gender | Female | 84.9% | 96 | 80.7% | 126 | 88.7% | 98 | 85.3% | 93 | 84.7% | 83 |
|  | Tariff | - | 88.2% | 15 | 74.3% | 13 | 95.2% | 10 | 87.5% | 14 | 71.4% | 5 |
|  | Tariff | 000-047 | 50.0% | 3 | 66.7% | 6 | 66.7% | 2 | 60.0% | 3 | 100.0% | 3 |
|  | Tariff | 048-095 | 72.8% | 38 | 72.9% | 43 | 87.9% | 29 | 84.6% | 33 | 74.6% | 24 |
|  | Tariff | 096-143 | 83.6% | 77 | 81.0% | 103 | 85.5% | 65 | 88.9% | 64 | 83.0% | 61 |
|  | Tariff | 144-191 | 93.8% | 15 | 91.7% | 33 | 90.9% | 30 | 85.7% | 18 | 100.0% | 23 |
|  | Tariff | 192-239 | 50.0% | 2 | 100.0% | 7 | 100.0% | 8 | 66.7% | 2 | 100.0% | 2 |
|  | Tariff | 240-287 | - | 0 | 100.0% | 3 | 100.0% | 1 | 100.0% | 1 | - | 0 |
|  | Tariff | 288-335 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| **Institute of Education, Health & Social Sciences** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Age | Under 21 | 84.5% | 147 | 87.2% | 136 | 88.6% | 117 | 82.0% | 109 | 73.5% | 75 |
|  | Age | 21-24 | 65.8% | 25 | 71.4% | 25 | 97.7% | 42 | 85.0% | 34 | 76.7% | 23 |
|  | Age | 25-29 | 67.9% | 19 | 73.1% | 19 | 86.7% | 13 | 95.8% | 23 | 100.0% | 22 |
|  | Age | 30-39 | 88.5% | 23 | 87.0% | 20 | 95.2% | 20 | 88.0% | 22 | 94.3% | 33 |
|  | Age | 40-49 | 90.9% | 20 | 80.0% | 16 | 94.1% | 16 | 95.8% | 23 | 85.2% | 23 |
|  | Age | 50+ | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
|  | Disability | Not Disabled | 82.5% | 198 | 83.0% | 181 | 93.7% | 177 | 87.3% | 172 | 81.5% | 141 |
|  | Disability | Dyslexic | 77.1% | 27 | 82.8% | 24 | 73.9% | 17 | 75.0% | 12 | 85.7% | 18 |
|  | Disability | Other Disability | 73.7% | 14 | 80.0% | 20 | 85.7% | 18 | 87.0% | 40 | 81.3% | 26 |
|  | Ethnicity | BAME | 58.8% | 10 | 57.9% | 11 | 80.0% | 12 | 71.4% | 5 | 66.7% | 8 |
|  | Ethnicity | White | 82.6% | 228 | 84.5% | 213 | 92.0% | 196 | 87.1% | 217 | 83.7% | 175 |
|  | Ethnicity | Unknown | 100.0% | 1 | 100.0% | 1 | 80.0% | 4 | 66.7% | 2 | 40.0% | 2 |
|  | Gender | Male | 79.4% | 27 | 79.3% | 23 | 92.1% | 35 | 78.1% | 25 | 81.3% | 26 |
|  | Gender | Female | 81.5% | 212 | 83.1% | 202 | 90.8% | 177 | 87.7% | 199 | 82.0% | 159 |
|  | Tariff | - | 75.3% | 73 | 71.6% | 68 | 95.2% | 60 | 91.4% | 85 | 82.5% | 66 |
|  | Tariff | 000-047 | 85.7% | 6 | 100.0% | 4 | 100.0% | 4 | 100.0% | 1 | 75.0% | 3 |
|  | Tariff | 048-095 | 76.3% | 45 | 81.3% | 39 | 86.2% | 50 | 72.5% | 29 | 70.6% | 24 |
|  | Tariff | 096-143 | 89.4% | 76 | 89.0% | 65 | 94.8% | 73 | 86.3% | 69 | 86.7% | 65 |
|  | Tariff | 144-191 | 83.3% | 35 | 93.6% | 44 | 85.7% | 24 | 86.1% | 31 | 80.0% | 24 |
|  | Tariff | 192-239 | 100.0% | 4 | 100.0% | 5 | 33.3% | 1 | 100.0% | 6 | 100.0% | 1 |
|  | Tariff | 240-287 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 100.0% | 2 | 100.0% | 2 |
|  | Tariff | 288-335 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 100.0% | 1 | - | 0 |
| **Institute of Sport, Nursing and Allied Health** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Age | Under 21 | 55.6% | 145 | 59.4% | 164 | 64.2% | 138 | 58.4% | 108 | 59.0% | 102 |
|  | Age | 21-24 | 59.3% | 16 | 73.1% | 19 | 69.6% | 16 | 63.2% | 12 | 60.0% | 12 |
|  | Age | 25-29 | 66.7% | 2 | 100.0% | 4 | 100.0% | 2 | - | 0 | 83.3% | 5 |
|  | Age | 30-39 | 75.0% | 3 | 100.0% | 1 | 100.0% | 2 | 100.0% | 1 | 0.0% | 0 |
|  | Age | 40-49 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 100.0% | 2 | 0.0% | 0 | - | 0 |
|  | Age | 50+ | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
|  | Disability | Not Disabled | 57.2% | 143 | 61.2% | 159 | 68.6% | 131 | 58.6% | 92 | 60.5% | 101 |
|  | Disability | Dyslexic | 48.6% | 18 | 60.5% | 23 | 39.4% | 13 | 57.5% | 23 | 45.0% | 9 |
|  | Disability | Other Disability | 62.5% | 5 | 66.7% | 6 | 80.0% | 16 | 60.0% | 6 | 69.2% | 9 |
|  | Ethnicity | BAME | 33.3% | 7 | 41.2% | 7 | 35.3% | 6 | 23.8% | 5 | 46.7% | 7 |
|  | Ethnicity | White | 58.5% | 159 | 62.6% | 181 | 67.8% | 154 | 62.2% | 115 | 60.2% | 109 |
|  | Ethnicity | Unknown | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | - | 0 | 100.0% | 1 | 75.0% | 3 |
|  | Gender | Male | 48.9% | 90 | 53.1% | 103 | 57.0% | 90 | 47.0% | 54 | 52.9% | 63 |
|  | Gender | Female | 68.5% | 76 | 75.2% | 85 | 81.4% | 70 | 72.8% | 67 | 69.1% | 56 |
|  | Tariff | - | 63.2% | 12 | 52.4% | 11 | 82.4% | 14 | 33.3% | 5 | 47.8% | 11 |
|  | Tariff | 000-047 | 62.5% | 5 | 33.3% | 2 | 0.0% | 0 | 25.0% | 1 | 66.7% | 2 |
|  | Tariff | 048-095 | 60.0% | 39 | 65.1% | 41 | 57.7% | 30 | 56.4% | 22 | 50.0% | 19 |
|  | Tariff | 096-143 | 55.8% | 53 | 65.7% | 69 | 63.6% | 56 | 63.8% | 44 | 75.0% | 51 |
|  | Tariff | 144-191 | 52.0% | 53 | 58.2% | 64 | 69.4% | 50 | 58.7% | 44 | 53.0% | 35 |
|  | Tariff | 192-239 | 66.7% | 4 | 0.0% | 0 | 88.9% | 8 | 100.0% | 4 | 50.0% | 1 |
|  | Tariff | 240-287 | - | 0 | 100.0% | 1 | 100.0% | 1 | 100.0% | 1 | - | 0 |
|  | Tariff | 288-335 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 50.0% | 1 | - | 0 | - | 0 |

1. <https://www.bournemouth.ac.uk/sites/default/files/asset/document/stuart-capstick.pdf> [↑](#endnote-ref-1)