



**City, University of London:**  
**Degree Outcomes Statement 2019/20**

**1. Introduction**

City's tradition of providing high-quality education relevant to business and the professions dates back 160 years. Today we welcome 20,000 students each year to study with us. International students, representing some 160 countries, and students from backgrounds under-represented in Higher Education form City's two majority cohorts. Over 70% of our home undergraduate students come from London and over 65% of our home undergraduate students come from widening participation backgrounds.

**2. Institutional Degree Classification Profile**

The degree classification profile contained in this Statement provides an overview of degree attainment data for City undergraduate students from 2015/16 - 2019/20. City has powers to award degrees for programmes designed and delivered by other institutions. As of 2019/20 this includes 65 undergraduate degree programmes delivered by City and 2 undergraduate degree programmes awarded by City but delivered by other institutions.

The proportion of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2.1 degrees increased by 10.9 percentage points from 70.9% to 81.8%, between 2015/16 and 2019/20 with the increase occurring in the last three years of this period. The increase in the proportion of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2.1 degrees has now put City in line with the sector average.

City's Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic student population is its most substantial accounting for 59.3% in 2019/20. This is an increase of 4.7% compared to 2018/19. The degree-awarding gap for 1<sup>st</sup> class and 2.1 degrees between White and Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic students varies across City's undergraduate degrees. The overall attainment gap for the academic year 2019/20 decreased overall from 11% to 5.9%. This reduction in the overall student degree-awarding gap is likely linked to an overall increase in the awards of good degrees and therefore may not be representative of a longer-term trend.

Over the five-year period, the undergraduate degree-awarding gap of 1<sup>st</sup> class and 2.1 degrees awarded between Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic and White students ranged from 4.8% to 10% across Academic Schools (Please see Table 1 below).

The degree awarding gap between White and Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic students has in some cases, at programme level, been due to Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic students performing better than White students. For example, in the Law School in 2015/16 and in 2018/19.

City is committed to empowering all students from all backgrounds to achieve their full potential. Over the past five years we have enhanced our efforts to address the degree awarding gaps for underrepresented groups, especially Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic students. Our most recent [Access and Participation Plan](#), submitted to the Office for Students, sets out how we will continue to address degree awarding gaps in partnership with students. Our Student Attainment Project, designed to identify, understand and address degree-awarding gaps impacting on particular groups

of students remains a priority of City's Education & Student Strategy.

**Table 1: Degree Awarding Gap by Year (2015/16 – 2019/20) and by School (2019/20)**

<b>Undergraduates White v BAME Students</b> <b>White students perform better than BAME students</b> <b>The degree-awarding gap below relate to 1sts and 2.1s degrees only</b>			
<b>Degree-awarding Gap by Year between White and BAME Students (2015/16 – 2019/20)</b>		<b>Degree-awarding Gap by School between White and BAME Students (2019/20)</b>	
Year	Degree-awarding Gap	School	Degree-awarding Gap
2019/20	5.9%	Business School	7%
2018/19	11%	City Law School	8%
2017/18	11%	School of Art and Social Sciences	5%
2016/17	17%	School of Mathematics, Computer Science and Engineering	4.8%
2015/16	12%	School of Health and Social Sciences	10%

**More information on the Institutional degree classification profile for all undergraduate students for the past five academic years (2015/16 – 2019/20) is set out in Appendix 1.**

### **3. Assessment and marking practices**

All programmes that lead to a City award operate in accordance with [Senate Regulation 19: Assessment Regulations](#). The Regulations cover all aspects of the conduct of assessment, how students' progress and how Awards are made. They set out provisions for Extenuating Circumstances, appointments and role of external examiners, functions of Assessment Boards and rules around academic conduct and integrity. Separate Regulations are in place to govern the [Conduct of Examinations](#).

In view of the need to make contingency arrangements for City to continue its activities during the Coronavirus pandemic, the [Contingency Senate Regulations 2019/20](#) was introduced. It supported the provisions in Senate Regulation 19 and provided a framework to allow progression and/or award during the affected period in 2019/20, ensuring that the integrity of City's assessment process was not compromised and that the application of the Regulations would not unfairly disadvantage any group of students.

In the design of assessments, City takes account of relevant external reference points such as

QAA subject benchmarks statements, the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications and the requirements of relevant Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body.

Specific assessment criteria are in place to demonstrate how the programme learning outcomes are attained. Details of the types of assessments and assessment descriptions are available to students in the programme specification, along with the programme learning outcomes, and in the module specifications in greater detail.

City formulated an alternative assessment approach and [Assessment and Safety Net Principles for 2019/20](#), in response to the pandemic by agreeing common underpinning principles to govern City's educational activity, providing a framework on teaching, online learning and assessment during the reporting year. As usual the approach was subject to PSRB requirements and sought to ensure student progression and award without devaluing City's degree awards. It assured academic quality and standards as well as an accessible and supportive environment for students.

Our [Assessment and feedback Policy](#) outlines the principles on which assessment is based including the use of assessment criteria, grade-related criteria, marking and moderation processes. Independent scrutiny of the assessment process for each programme is undertaken by at least one External Examiner appointed according to the criteria set out in the [External Examiners Policy](#). Several staff have undertaken the Advance HE external examiner programme and the developer programme.

On behalf of the University's Senate, Assessment Boards for each programme oversee student progress between years and degree classifications. They safeguard the consistency, fairness and standards of City's awards and the application of the Assessment Regulations from which its decisions are made.

City's academic regulations, policies and procedures are robust and reviewed regularly. Sanctions for academic misconduct are set out in the [Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy](#). Academic appeals for taught and research programmes are governed by [Senate Regulations 20 and 21](#) respectively. Academic Appeals for Validated taught and research programmes are governed by [Senate Regulations 20b and 21b](#) respectively. Reports on appeals, extenuating circumstances and academic misconduct are considered on an annual basis by Senate and its sub-committees, ensuring a transparent and consistent approach for all students.

#### **4. Academic governance**

Senate is the primary body with responsibility for the regulation, governance and quality assurance of City's programmes, including those delivered in partnership.

Senate reports and provides assurance to Council, the governing body, on academic quality and standards through regular reports. Additional assurance is provided to Council through independent internal audits and the requirements of external regulators and assessors.

The Educational Quality Committee is a sub-committee of Senate and oversees the implementation of the quality assurance framework. Assessment Boards are sub-committees of Senate with delegated authority to approve Awards and degree classifications.

The quality and standards of validated programmes delivered by partner institutions are governed through Assessment and Course Boards, chaired by City. Course Boards report to City's Collaborative Provision Committee, a sub-committee of Senate. Assessment Boards have a direct reporting line to Senate.

In line with QAA UK Quality Code independent scrutiny and externality is core to City's governance arrangements and provides assurance that our practices are sound and that the expected FHEQ and professional standards are met. Our framework includes:

- i. independent scrutiny during the approval of new programmes and the periodic programme reviews.
- ii. independent scrutiny of assessments and assessment criteria through External Examiners. External Examiners Reports which are responded to by Schools and reported to Senate and its sub-committees via an Annual Report.

## **5. Classification algorithms**

As set out in Senate Regulation 19: Assessment Regulations, classifications are determined according to the overall aggregate mark achieved in modules, with the credit value of each module determining its weighting in the aggregation of marks. The weighting of each year in the calculation of the overall aggregate mark is determined during the approval of a programme in accordance with [Senate Regulation 15: Undergraduate Programmes](#). For Bachelor's Degrees at least 50% of the overall aggregate mark must come from Year 3 assessment and not more than 15% can come from Year 1.

This flexibility is to accommodate disciplinary differences. The typical weighting for Bachelor's programme is:

- Year 1: 10%
- Year 2: 30%
- Year 3: 60%

Some programmes operate with approved variations to the standard classification algorithm due to specific professional body requirements, because they are delivered in partnership with another institution and for other legitimate reasons such as, market standard within subject disciplines.

Students are normally permitted a maximum of two attempts at an assessment unless there are extenuating circumstances or specific professional body requirements. Marks for assessments passed at the second attempt are capped at the pass mark. Compensation, if not prevented by PSRB, is available for failed modules in certain circumstances and in accordance with strict criteria to ensure that the learning outcomes for modules within each year of the programme have been met

## **6. Teaching practices and learning resources**

Our Education & Student Strategy commits to enhanced support, development and recognition of teaching excellence. This is delivered through a partnership between our academic Schools and our central Learning Enhancement & Development directorate (LEaD), and with input from the Students' Union.

Each academic School has its own Learning & Teaching Strategy and LEaD encourage and support staff to enhance their teaching excellence via a range of workshops aligned to the priorities of academic Schools alongside 1-2-1, support, drop-in sessions, online support and modules provided as part of the MA Academic Practice Programme. Additionally, there is an accredited CPD programme for staff to gain recognition at the appropriate level of HEA Fellowship linked to their role.

City's academic staff contribute a breadth and depth of teaching, professional and research expertise

which, in combination, allow us to fulfil our institutional mission of academic excellence for business and the professions.

During 19/20 whilst the academic year started as planned the Covid -19 Pandemic brought about widespread change across the sector with all teaching, learning and assessment activity except some essential health focused teaching all moving online. In the first instance much of this was done quickly and staff in LEaD provided support with a range of workshops and individual advice. Additionally, LEaD provided a range of online guidance which presented not only the technical aspects of moving to online learning, but the pedagogical considerations. A teaching toolkit was also developed to support the ongoing changes that were needed.

Once the initial move online had taken place there was an opportunity to develop more focused support and guidance which included then exploring any redesign of modules and programmes. LEaD has coordinated a range of activities so that staff could share their experiences and good practices across the Institution. This experience has led many staff to review their practice around blended and online learning which will continue to enhance the students' education experience in the future.

## **7. Identifying good practice and actions**

Recognising and sharing areas of excellence and good practice is a proud and long- standing tradition at City.

It takes place through various platforms including our Annual Programme Evaluation (APEs) process, and since 2018/19, through the City Learning and Teaching (CLT) Forum.

Institutionally, over the last five academic years we have received recognition and praise for our robust and varied teaching practices, the academic support we provide to our students and our learning resources. Evidence of this can be found from our student body, via the NSS written feedback, as well as our External Examiners in their annual reports.

In 2019/20 all APEs were received by the published deadline and the overall quality was high. The majority of completed APE forms provided an effective and robust overview of the health of programmes, including good practice items and comprehensive action plans mapped against the University's KPIs. Common themes of good practice included:

- rapid and appropriate adaptation to Covid circumstances
- diversity of teaching and learning methods
- varied, challenging and diverse use of assessment methods
- high quality feedback practices
- employability embedded in curriculum

During the 2019/20 academic year we implemented initiatives at institutional and subject level to recognise and mitigate the impact of the global pandemic on our educational delivery and diverse students. Over the summer of 2020 considerable work was undertaken to redesign all programmes in the University to prepare for delivery during the 2020/21 academic year. Methods of teaching and of assessment were redesigned to support students who would largely be studying remotely with only limited face to face activity. We also reviewed our policies and regulations, including the Extenuating Circumstances Policy to ensure students are fully supported throughout the year.

## **8. Monitoring and Review**

To ensure progress, the Degree Outcomes Statement will be reviewed and published annually.

## Appendix 1: Degree Outcome Classification Profile

The information contained within this Institutional degree classification profile provides an overview of degree attainment data for Undergraduate City students from 2015/16 – 2019/20. The Report contains data on degree outcomes broken down by Age, Disability, Ethnicity, Gender and Schools.

			2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
<b>University (All)</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	22.7%	20.3%	22.7%	24.0%	29.2%	
	<b>2.1</b>	48.2%	48.9%	48.3%	48.7%	52.6%	
	<b>2.2</b>	22.9%	24.1%	23.3%	23.1%	16.1%	
	<b>3rd</b>	6.2%	6.7%	5.7%	4.2%	2.2%	
<b>Age</b>	<b>Young (&lt;21)</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	23.6%	20.0%	22.8%	23.3%	29.6%
		<b>2.1</b>	49.6%	50.5%	49.3%	49.7%	54.4%
		<b>2.2</b>	22.3%	23.5%	22.9%	23.2%	14.7%
		<b>3rd</b>	4.5%	5.9%	4.9%	3.7%	1.4%
	<b>Mature (&gt;21)</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	18.7%	21.4%	21.8%	27.5%	28.0%
		<b>2.1</b>	41.9%	42.1%	43.4%	43.3%	48.1%
		<b>2.2</b>	25.7%	26.5%	25.1%	22.5%	19.1%
		<b>3rd</b>	13.7%	10.1%	9.7%	6.7%	4.9%
<b>Disability</b>	<b>No Disability</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	22.8%	20.8%	23.0%	23.8%	29.3%
		<b>2.1</b>	48.5%	48.5%	48.3%	49.0%	52.5%
		<b>2.2</b>	22.8%	24.3%	22.9%	23.1%	16.1%
		<b>3rd</b>	6.0%	6.4%	5.8%	4.1%	2.1%
	<b>Disability</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	21.1%	13.0%	17.9%	27.6%	27.8%
		<b>2.1</b>	43.0%	55.8%	48.2%	43.7%	53.1%
		<b>2.2</b>	25.8%	20.1%	28.6%	23.6%	16.0%
		<b>3rd</b>	10.2%	11.0%	5.4%	5.2%	3.1%
<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>BAME</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	19.0%	15.5%	18.5%	21.1%	27.3%
		<b>2.1</b>	48.2%	47.9%	48.7%	48.2%	52.7%
		<b>2.2</b>	25.8%	28.2%	26.1%	25.8%	17.9%
		<b>3rd</b>	6.9%	8.4%	6.7%	4.9%	2.1%
	<b>White</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	29.8%	27.8%	31.9%	32.0%	33.9%
		<b>2.1</b>	49.3%	52.4%	46.4%	48.5%	52.0%
		<b>2.2</b>	17.4%	16.1%	17.4%	17.0%	11.9%
		<b>3rd</b>	3.5%	3.7%	4.3%	2.5%	2.2%
	<b>Other</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	26.5%	28.2%	20.6%	23.9%	22.6%
		<b>2.1</b>	42.6%	42.0%	52.8%	50.3%	54.8%
		<b>2.2</b>	20.0%	24.1%	23.1%	21.8%	19.4%
		<b>3rd</b>	11.0%	5.7%	3.5%	4.0%	3.2%
<b>Gender</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	20.9%	17.9%	20.6%	24.5%	28.2%
		<b>2.1</b>	50.2%	51.3%	49.6%	50.8%	54.4%
		<b>2.2</b>	22.8%	23.8%	23.7%	21.3%	15.1%
		<b>3rd</b>	3.1%	3.1%	3.2%	2.1%	0.8%
	<b>Male</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	25.0%	23.3%	25.3%	23.5%	30.5%
		<b>2.1</b>	45.6%	45.9%	46.7%	45.9%	50.0%

			2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
		<b>2.2</b>	23.1%	24.5%	22.7%	25.4%	17.4%
		<b>3rd</b>	6.4%	6.3%	5.2%	5.2%	2.1%
<b>Schools</b>	<b>SHS</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	21.3%	19.0%	26.2%	27.9%	33.7%
		<b>2.1</b>	42.9%	40.3%	36.6%	43.9%	48.2%
		<b>2.2</b>	20.9%	25.4%	23.1%	21.7%	14.7%
		<b>3rd</b>	14.9%	15.3%	14.1%	6.5%	3.4%
	<b>Law</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	4.3%	5.4%	6.4%	7.7%	15.2%
		<b>2.1</b>	46.4%	47.9%	51.1%	51.3%	68.0%
		<b>2.2</b>	44.6%	39.7%	37.0%	35.2%	16.3%
		<b>3rd</b>	4.7%	6.9%	5.5%	5.7%	0.5%
	<b>Business</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	27.5%	25.8%	26.5%	25.4%	28.7%
		<b>2.1</b>	52.5%	54.5%	51.1%	51.1%	50.8%
		<b>2.2</b>	17.8%	17.1%	19.8%	21.9%	19.9%
		<b>3rd</b>	2.1%	2.6%	2.6%	1.6%	0.6%
	<b>SASS</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	20.8%	17.4%	18.5%	22.8%	21.6%
		<b>2.1</b>	57.2%	58.8%	58.1%	57.7%	59.1%
		<b>2.2</b>	20.0%	21.0%	20.6%	17.4%	16.0%
		<b>3rd</b>	2.0%	2.9%	2.8%	2.1%	3.4%
	<b>SMSCE</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	31.1%	27.0%	29.5%	31.9%	47.7%
		<b>2.1</b>	39.3%	39.8%	41.5%	34.7%	37.3%
		<b>2.2</b>	22.7%	25.8%	22.9%	26.0%	12.3%
		<b>3rd</b>	7.0%	7.4%	6.1%	7.4%	2.8%
<b>IMD Quintiles (Home students)</b> Note not all student postcodes are valid thereby do not have a quintile and they were excluded from the calculation.	<b>Q1 (most disadvantaged)</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	20.6%	17.8%	18.7%	22.2%	27.8%
		<b>2.1</b>	46.3%	43.8%	45.9%	44.5%	48.9%
		<b>2.2</b>	23.8%	30.4%	27.4%	27.5%	18.3%
		<b>3rd</b>	9.3%	8.0%	8.0%	5.8%	5.0%
	<b>Q2</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	21.5%	16.4%	19.7%	22.3%	30.0%
		<b>2.1</b>	44.9%	47.7%	50.5%	48.5%	50.2%
		<b>2.2</b>	25.4%	26.0%	22.8%	24.1%	16.3%
		<b>3rd</b>	8.3%	9.9%	7.0%	5.1%	3.5%
	<b>Q3</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	26.5%	16.9%	23.9%	23.4%	29.6%
		<b>2.1</b>	47.8%	54.1%	44.1%	51.0%	52.3%
		<b>2.2</b>	21.2%	21.3%	27.0%	21.8%	15.1%
		<b>3rd</b>	4.4%	7.7%	5.0%	3.8%	3.0%
	<b>Q4</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	21.8%	19.7%	23.2%	26.5%	31.0%
		<b>2.1</b>	48.6%	50.0%	48.2%	49.7%	54.6%
		<b>2.2</b>	24.5%	22.7%	24.1%	21.4%	12.4%
		<b>3rd</b>	5.0%	7.6%	4.4%	2.4%	2.0%
	<b>Q5 (most advantaged)</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	20.8%	25.9%	32.4%	31.0%	34.6%
		<b>2.1</b>	57.8%	49.7%	45.7%	54.0%	47.6%
		<b>2.2</b>	16.8%	19.5%	16.0%	12.1%	13.0%
		<b>3rd</b>	4.6%	4.9%	5.9%	2.9%	4.9%
<b>Fees (Student fees status)</b>	<b>Home (Home and EU Student Fees)</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	23.9%	20.4%	24.0%	24.9%	29.6%
		<b>2.1</b>	48.5%	49.6%	47.3%	48.0%	52.3%
		<b>2.2</b>	22.2%	23.8%	23.4%	22.5%	14.5%
		<b>3rd</b>	5.4%	6.2%	5.3%	4.6%	3.6%

			2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
	<b>Overseas</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	19.8%	19.5%	19.1%	19.8%	24.4%
		<b>2.1</b>	47.3%	49.5%	51.3%	49.8%	50.4%
		<b>2.2</b>	27.6%	26.7%	25.3%	26.3%	23.1%
		<b>3rd</b>	5.3%	4.2%	4.3%	3.4%	2.1%
<b>Entry Qualification (Home Students / excludes EU and Overseas)</b>	<b>No tariff</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	21.5%	24.4%	30.0%	30.9%	25.6%
		<b>2.1</b>	28.3%	38.2%	31.4%	36.4%	50.7%
		<b>2.2</b>	29.8%	24.0%	25.0%	23.0%	18.7%
		<b>3rd</b>	20.5%	13.4%	13.6%	9.7%	0.6%
	<b>Tariff points 10 to 160</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	32.0%	27.5%
		<b>2.1</b>	44.4%	28.6%	20.0%	36.0%	56.3%
		<b>2.2</b>	33.3%	57.1%	60.0%	28.0%	14.9%
		<b>3rd</b>	16.7%	14.3%	20.0%	4.0%	0.5%
	<b>Tariff points 170 to 230</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	16.7%	6.3%	17.6%	0.0%	32.9%
		<b>2.1</b>	33.3%	43.8%	52.9%	50.0%	51.5%
		<b>2.2</b>	16.7%	43.8%	23.5%	50.0%	14.3%
		<b>3rd</b>	33.3%	6.3%	5.9%	0.0%	0.4%
	<b>Tariff points 240 to 290</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	13.6%	10.5%	13.0%	15.2%	31.3%
		<b>2.1</b>	54.2%	39.5%	47.8%	51.5%	39.1%
		<b>2.2</b>	23.7%	42.1%	23.9%	27.3%	23.4%
		<b>3rd</b>	8.5%	7.9%	15.2%	6.1%	3.1%
	<b>Tariff points 300 to 350</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	26.7%	19.3%	23.9%	24.3%	33.6%
		<b>2.1</b>	60.0%	49.4%	46.6%	51.5%	41.4%
		<b>2.2</b>	12.2%	27.7%	27.3%	18.4%	19.0%
		<b>3rd</b>	1.1%	3.6%	2.3%	5.8%	3.4%
	<b>Tariff points 360 to 420</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	22.4%	20.3%	31.1%	19.3%	32.3%
		<b>2.1</b>	63.5%	50.0%	41.9%	55.7%	42.7%
		<b>2.2</b>	12.9%	24.3%	20.3%	18.2%	19.8%
		<b>3rd</b>	1.2%	5.4%	6.8%	6.8%	2.1%
	<b>Tariff points &gt;420</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	35.9%	19.6%	40.8%	42.4%	43.0%
		<b>2.1</b>	43.6%	45.7%	28.6%	35.6%	31.4%
		<b>2.2</b>	17.9%	26.1%	20.4%	22.0%	14.0%
		<b>3rd</b>	2.6%	2.2%	2.0%	0.0%	5.8%



			2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	Total
	<b>Female</b>	<b>1st</b>	23.8%	25.0%	23.3%	25.3%	23.5%	24.2%
		<b>2.1</b>	46.5%	45.6%	45.9%	46.7%	45.9%	46.1%
		<b>2.2</b>	24.1%	23.1%	24.5%	22.7%	25.4%	24.0%
		<b>3rd</b>	5.7%	6.4%	6.3%	5.2%	5.2%	5.7%
<b>Schools</b>								
	<b>SHS</b>	<b>1st</b>	16.4%	21.3%	19.0%	26.2%	27.9%	21.8%
		<b>2.1</b>	40.5%	42.9%	40.3%	36.6%	43.9%	40.9%
		<b>2.2</b>	26.5%	20.9%	25.4%	23.1%	21.7%	23.6%
		<b>3rd</b>	16.4%	21.3%	19.0%	26.2%	27.9%	21.8%
	<b>Law</b>	<b>1st</b>	4.2%	4.3%	5.4%	6.4%	7.7%	5.8%
		<b>2.1</b>	53.2%	46.4%	47.9%	51.1%	51.3%	49.9%
		<b>2.2</b>	36.1%	44.6%	39.7%	37.0%	35.2%	38.5%
		<b>3rd</b>	6.5%	4.7%	6.9%	5.5%	5.7%	5.9%
	<b>Business</b>	<b>1st</b>	30.3%	27.5%	25.8%	26.5%	25.4%	27.0%
		<b>2.1</b>	53.0%	52.5%	54.5%	51.1%	51.1%	52.5%
		<b>2.2</b>	15.4%	17.8%	17.1%	19.8%	21.9%	18.5%
		<b>3rd</b>	1.4%	2.1%	2.6%	2.6%	1.6%	2.1%
	<b>SASS</b>	<b>1st</b>	17.2%	20.8%	17.4%	18.5%	22.8%	19.6%
		<b>2.1</b>	61.1%	57.2%	58.8%	58.1%	57.7%	58.4%
		<b>2.2</b>	18.0%	20.0%	21.0%	20.6%	17.4%	19.4%
		<b>3rd</b>	3.8%	2.0%	2.9%	2.8%	2.1%	2.6%
	<b>SMSCE</b>	<b>1st</b>	27.3%	31.1%	27%	29.5%	31.9%	29.4%
		<b>2.1</b>	39.5%	39.3%	39.8%	41.5%	34.7%	39.0%
		<b>2.2</b>	24.6%	22.7%	25.8%	22.9%	26.0%	24.4%
		<b>3rd</b>	8.6%	7.0%	7.4%	6.1%	7.4%	7.3%
<b>IMD Quintiles (Home students)</b>								
Note not all student postcodes are valid thereby do not have a quintile and they were excluded from the calculation.	<b>Q1 (most disadvantaged)</b>	<b>1st</b>	18.8%	20.6%	17.8%	18.7%	22.2%	19.6%
		<b>2.1</b>	44.4%	46.3%	43.8%	45.9%	44.5%	44.9%
		<b>2.2</b>	25.3%	23.8%	30.4%	27.4%	27.5%	27.0%
		<b>3rd</b>	11.5%	9.3%	8.0%	8.0%	5.8%	8.4%
	<b>Q2</b>	<b>1st</b>	18.6%	21.5%	16.4%	19.7%	22.3%	19.8%
		<b>2.1</b>	45.9%	44.9%	47.7%	50.5%	48.5%	47.6%
		<b>2.2</b>	24.9%	25.4%	26.0%	22.8%	24.1%	24.6%
		<b>3rd</b>	10.6%	8.3%	9.9%	7.0%	5.1%	8.0%
	<b>Q3</b>	<b>1st</b>	18.4%	26.5%	16.9%	23.9%	23.4%	21.9%
		<b>2.1</b>	51.8%	47.8%	54.1%	44.1%	51.0%	49.7%
		<b>2.2</b>	23.9%	21.2%	21.3%	27.0%	21.8%	23.1%
		<b>3rd</b>	5.9%	4.4%	7.7%	5.0%	3.8%	5.3%
	<b>Q4</b>	<b>1st</b>	23.4%	21.8%	19.7%	23.2%	26.5%	23.0%
		<b>2.1</b>	50.2%	48.6%	50.0%	48.2%	49.7%	49.4%
		<b>2.2</b>	19.9%	24.5%	22.7%	24.1%	21.4%	22.5%
		<b>3rd</b>	6.5%	5.0%	7.6%	4.4%	2.4%	5.1%
	<b>Q5 (most advantaged)</b>	<b>1st</b>	23.0%	20.8%	25.9%	32.4%	31.0%	26.8%
		<b>2.1</b>	49.3%	57.8%	49.7%	45.7%	54.0%	51.3%
		<b>2.2</b>	20.9%	16.8%	19.5%	16.0%	12.1%	16.9%
		<b>3rd</b>	6.8%	4.6%	4.9%	5.9%	2.9%	5.0%

			2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	Total
<b>Fees (Student fees status)</b>	<b>Home (Home and EU Student Fees)</b>	<b>1st</b>	20.6%	23.9%	20.4%	24.0%	24.9%	22.9%
		<b>2.1</b>	48.8%	48.5%	49.6%	47.3%	48.0%	48.4%
		<b>2.2</b>	23.6%	22.2%	23.8%	23.4%	22.5%	23.1%
		<b>3rd</b>	7.0%	5.4%	6.2%	5.3%	4.6%	5.6%
	<b>Overseas</b>	<b>1st</b>	19.4%	19.8%	19.5%	19.1%	19.8%	19.5%
		<b>2.1</b>	51.0%	47.3%	49.5%	51.3%	49.8%	49.8%
		<b>2.2</b>	24.8%	27.6%	26.7%	25.3%	26.3%	26.2%
		<b>3rd</b>	4.8%	5.3%	4.2%	4.3%	3.4%	4.4%
<b>Entry Qualification (Home Students / excludes EU and Overseas)</b>	<b>No tariff</b>	<b>1st</b>	16.1%	21.5%	24.4%	30.0%	30.9%	23.6%
		<b>2.1</b>	37.1%	28.3%	38.2%	31.4%	36.4%	34.6%
		<b>2.2</b>	27.8%	29.8%	24.0%	25.0%	23.0%	26.2%
		<b>3rd</b>	19.0%	20.5%	13.4%	13.6%	9.7%	15.7%
	<b>Tariff points 10 to 160</b>	<b>1st</b>	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	32.0%	12.7%
		<b>2.1</b>	43.8%	44.4%	28.6%	20.0%	36.0%	38.0%
		<b>2.2</b>	56.3%	33.3%	57.1%	60.0%	28.0%	40.8%
		<b>3rd</b>	0.0%	16.7%	14.3%	20.0%	4.0%	8.5%
	<b>Tariff points 170 to 230</b>	<b>1st</b>	8.3%	16.7%	6.3%	17.6%	0.0%	10.1%
		<b>2.1</b>	29.2%	33.3%	43.8%	52.9%	50.0%	40.6%
		<b>2.2</b>	45.8%	16.7%	43.8%	23.5%	50.0%	37.7%
		<b>3rd</b>	16.7%	33.3%	6.3%	5.9%	0.0%	11.6%
	<b>Tariff points 240 to 290</b>	<b>1st</b>	7.4%	13.6%	10.5%	13.0%	15.2%	11.7%
		<b>2.1</b>	51.9%	54.2%	39.5%	47.8%	51.5%	49.6%
		<b>2.2</b>	31.5%	23.7%	42.1%	23.9%	27.3%	29.1%
		<b>3rd</b>	9.3%	8.5%	7.9%	15.2%	6.1%	9.6%
	<b>Tariff points 300 to 350</b>	<b>1st</b>	21.0%	26.7%	19.3%	23.9%	24.3%	23.1%
		<b>2.1</b>	53.1%	60.0%	49.4%	46.6%	51.5%	52.1%
		<b>2.2</b>	24.7%	12.2%	27.7%	27.3%	18.4%	21.8%
		<b>3rd</b>	1.2%	1.1%	3.6%	2.3%	5.8%	2.9%
	<b>Tariff points 360 to 420</b>	<b>1st</b>	18.6%	22.4%	20.3%	31.1%	19.3%	22.4%
		<b>2.1</b>	50.8%	63.5%	50.0%	41.9%	55.7%	52.9%
		<b>2.2</b>	30.5%	12.9%	24.3%	20.3%	18.2%	20.5%
		<b>3rd</b>	0.0%	1.2%	5.4%	6.8%	6.8%	4.2%
	<b>Tariff points &gt;420</b>	<b>1st</b>	40.4%	35.9%	19.6%	40.8%	42.4%	40.4%
		<b>2.1</b>	42.3%	43.6%	45.7%	28.6%	35.6%	42.3%
		<b>2.2</b>	15.4%	17.9%	26.1%	20.4%	22.0%	15.4%
		<b>3rd</b>	0.0%	2.6%	2.2%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%

## Statement Details Table

<b>Document title:</b>	Degree Outcomes Statement 2019/20
<b>Maintained by:</b>	Quality and Academic Development
<b>Owned by:</b>	Student and Academic Services
<b>Approving Committee or Body:</b>	Senate
<b>Published:</b>	July 2021
<b>Next Publication:</b>	July 2022
<b>Current version:</b>	Version 1
<b>Location of master document:</b>	Drive Address: S:\QUAD\Quality Manual
<b>Website Link:</b>	<a href="https://www.city.ac.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0003/623028/Degree-Outcomes-Statement-2019-20.pdf">https://www.city.ac.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0003/623028/Degree-Outcomes-Statement-2019-20.pdf</a>
<b>If you have queries about this document or if you require this document in an alternative format, please contact:</b>	<a href="mailto:quad@city.ac.uk">quad@city.ac.uk</a>