



## City, University of London

### Degree Outcomes Statement 2018/19

#### 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 Institutional degree classification profile contained in this Statement provides an overview of degree attainment data for City undergraduate students from 2014/15 to 2018/19. City has powers to award degrees for programmes designed and delivered by other institutions. As of 2018/19 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 3.7 percentage points from 69% to 72.7%, between 2014/15 and 2018/19 with the increase occurring in the last three years of this period. However, the proportion of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2.1 degrees remains below the sector average by 4 percentage points.

City's Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic student population is its most substantial accounting for 54.6% in 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.

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 in 2018/19 ranged from 5% to 15% across Academic Schools (Please see Table 1) below). There is wide variance at programme level across the Schools and the table below presents a range of the percentage variances for selected programmes (Please see Table 2 below).

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.

<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</b> <b>between White and BAME Students</b> <b>(2014/15 – 2018/19)</b>		<b>Degree-awarding Gap by School</b> <b>between White and BAME Students</b> <b>(2018/19)</b>	
Year	Degree-awarding Gap	School	Degree-awarding Gap
2018/19	11%	Business School	5%
2017/18	11%	City Law School	11%
2016/17	17%	School of Art and Social Sciences	12%
2015/16	12%	School of Mathematics, Computer Science and Engineering	14.5%
2014/15	11%	School of Health and Social Sciences	15%

**Table 1: Degree Awarding Gap by Year (2014/15 – 2018/19) and by School (2018/19)**

School	Undergraduate Programme variance between Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic and White Students in 2018/19
SHS	Midwifery BAME vs White variance 3.6% in 2018/19, Optometry 18.9% and Nursing Mental Health 35%.
SASS	Economics BAME vs White variance 5.6% in 2018/19, Journalism (single hon) 20.8% and Criminology 37.1%.
Law	Law BAME vs White variance 5.5% in 2018/19, Law (study abroad) 16.7% and Law (entry level) 25%.
Business school	Business Studies with specialism in Finance BAME vs White variance 4.3% in 2018/19, Management 19.7% and Banking and International Finance (with Placement) 25%.
MSCSE	Civil Engineering BEng BAME vs White variance 5.7% in 2018/19, Computer Science 17% and Mathematics and Finance 25%.

**Table 2: Undergraduate Programme variance between Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic and White Students (2018/19)**

**More information on the Institutional degree classification profile for all undergraduate students for the past five academic years (2014/15 – 2018/19) 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 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. 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.

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 who are appointed according to the criteria set out in the [External Examiners Policy](#). A number of staff have undertaken the Advance HE external examiner programme and the developer programme. From Spring 2021, the programme will be provided for staff across City who are or plan to be External Examiners.

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 or because they are delivered in partnership with another institution.

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 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.

The educational technology team have seen increased engagement due to the emphasis on the integration of technology to enhance teaching. In total, 594 staff attended workshops on a range of educational technologies.

City has a strong background in the production of multimedia to support teaching and learning. This has included the production of series of multimedia resources to support the Distance LLB which launched in September 2016 and involved depicting "real-world" scenes taking place in a fictional town to supplement student's learning by putting the topics into practice. Other examples include the production of videos to support practical activities, such as teaching the focimetry technique in Optometry, videos to help health students relate to service users, and a series of case studies based on a real company for Business Management.

Feedback has shown that the use of video has improved student engagement with learning materials and enabled us to provide experiences that would not have been possible otherwise.

The assessment strategy review for all undergraduate programmes in 2017/18 and 2018/19 led to a reduction in the number of assessments across some programmes and revisions to the assessment criteria across others. There was an across programme implementation of a new approach to assessment criteria for the LLB programme in which students were involved.

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

Recognising and sharing areas of excellence and good practice is a proud and long-standing tradition at City. 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 from both our student body (in the NSS written feedback) as well as our External Examiners in their annual reports. Additionally, in 2018/19 across many of our PSRB accredited programmes, a total of 188 commendations for good practice were made during external review processes. Common themes included personalised support for students, excellent and innovative teaching practices and the quality of employability support within and beyond the curriculum.

Sharing of good practice at City also takes place through various platforms including our Annual Programme Evaluation process, and since 2018/19, through the City Learning and Teaching (CLT) Forum.

Through the course of City's Education Strategy 2012-2016 there was an improvement of 3.4% in the continuation of undergraduate students and improvements have continued. To achieve and sustain improvement we have implemented initiatives at institutional and subject level recognising the diversity of our students including the introduction of attendance support and follow-up and targeted interventions.

We work in partnership with the Students' Union to ensure that we gain feedback from our students and respond in a timely way. Recent work has included a review of the student representation system and of more effective ways of gaining and responding to student feedback.

For 2019/20 Degree Outcome Statement, the mitigations made to assessments due to the impact of COVID-19 in 2019/20 including City's 'Assessment and Safety Net Principles' and the measures afforded in the Institution's 'Contingency Senate Regulations 2019/20' will be reviewed for any impact on City's degree outcome. The findings and any actions will be considered as part of the publication of subsequent Degree Outcome Statement.

## **8. Monitoring and Review**

To ensure progress, the Degree Outcomes Statement will be reviewed and published annually. Where necessary, this statement may be reviewed mid-year to ensure that the information available on our external website is current.

## 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 2014/15 – 2018/19. The Report contains data on degree outcomes broken down by Age, Disability, Ethnicity, Gender and Schools.

		2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	Total	
<b>University (All)</b>		<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	20.8%	22.7%	20.3%	22.7%	24.0%	22.1%
		<b>2.1</b>	48.2%	48.2%	48.9%	48.3%	48.7%	48.5%
		<b>2.2</b>	22.9%	22.9%	24.1%	23.3%	23.1%	23.3%
		<b>3rd</b>	8.0%	6.2%	6.7%	5.7%	4.2%	6.1%
<b>Age</b>	<b>Young (&lt;21)</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	21.9%	23.6%	20.0%	22.8%	23.3%	22.4%
		<b>2.1</b>	50.4%	49.6%	50.5%	49.3%	49.7%	49.9%
		<b>2.2</b>	21.9%	22.3%	23.5%	22.9%	23.2%	22.8%
		<b>3rd</b>	5.8%	4.5%	5.9%	4.9%	3.7%	4.9%
	<b>Mature (&gt;21)</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	17.8%	18.7%	21.4%	21.8%	27.5%	21.2%
		<b>2.1</b>	42.1%	41.9%	42.1%	43.4%	43.3%	42.5%
		<b>2.2</b>	25.9%	25.7%	26.5%	25.1%	22.5%	25.2%
		<b>3rd</b>	14.2%	13.7%	10.1%	9.7%	6.7%	11.0%
<b>Disability</b>	<b>No Disability</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	21.1%	22.8%	20.8%	23.0%	23.8%	22.3%
		<b>2.1</b>	48.1%	48.5%	48.5%	48.3%	49.0%	48.5%
		<b>2.2</b>	22.8%	22.8%	24.3%	22.9%	23.1%	23.2%
		<b>3rd</b>	8.0%	6.0%	6.4%	5.8%	4.1%	6.0%
	<b>Disability</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	16.1%	21.1%	13.0%	17.9%	27.6%	19.4%
		<b>2.1</b>	50.0%	43.0%	55.8%	48.2%	43.7%	48.1%
		<b>2.2</b>	25.0%	25.8%	20.1%	28.6%	23.6%	24.6%
		<b>3rd</b>	8.9%	10.2%	11.0%	5.4%	5.2%	7.9%
<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>BAME</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	16.9%	19.0%	15.5%	18.5%	21.1%	18.3%
		<b>2.1</b>	48.6%	48.2%	47.9%	48.7%	48.2%	48.3%
		<b>2.2</b>	25.6%	25.8%	28.2%	26.1%	25.8%	26.3%
		<b>3rd</b>	8.9%	6.9%	8.4%	6.7%	4.9%	7.1%
	<b>White</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	27.7%	29.8%	27.8%	31.9%	32.0%	29.8%
		<b>2.1</b>	48.3%	49.3%	52.4%	46.4%	48.5%	49.1%
		<b>2.2</b>	17.5%	17.4%	16.1%	17.4%	17.0%	17.0%
		<b>3rd</b>	6.6%	3.5%	3.7%	4.3%	2.5%	4.1%
	<b>Other</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	22.7%	26.5%	28.2%	20.6%	23.9%	24.2%
		<b>2.1</b>	44.7%	42.6%	42.0%	52.8%	50.3%	47.7%
		<b>2.2</b>	25.3%	20.0%	24.1%	23.1%	21.8%	22.6%
		<b>3rd</b>	7.3%	11.0%	5.7%	3.5%	4.0%	5.5%
<b>Gender</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	18.5%	20.9%	17.9%	20.6%	24.5%	20.6%
		<b>2.1</b>	49.6%	50.2%	51.3%	49.6%	50.8%	50.3%
		<b>2.2</b>	22.1%	22.8%	23.8%	23.7%	21.3%	22.7%
		<b>3rd</b>	4.3%	3.1%	3.1%	3.2%	2.1%	3.1%

			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 2018/19
<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>	December 2020
<b>Next Publication:</b>	December 2021
<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/0004/579982/Degree-Outcomes-Statement.pdf">https://www.city.ac.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0004/579982/Degree-Outcomes-Statement.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>