

# City, University of London: Undergraduate Degree Outcomes Statement 2021/22

## 1. Introduction

City's tradition of providing high-quality education relevant to business and the professions dates back 160 years. Today we welcome approximately 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. On average 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 (UG) students from 2017/18 – 2021/22. City has powers to award degrees for programmes designed and delivered by other institutions. As of 2021/22 this includes 72 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> class and 2:1 degrees decreased by 3.2 percentage points from 87.5% to 84.3%, between 2020/21 and 2021/22. Despite this decrease, City remains above the sector average of 78%, which also fell from 82% in the previous year.

The table below presents the classifications of degrees awarded by the University to all its undergraduate students between 2017/18 and 2021/22. (UK domiciled and International students)

Year of Award	Total Awards	3 <sup>rd</sup>	2:2	2:1	1 <sup>st</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup> and 2:1 combined
2017/18	2580	5.7%	23.3%	48.3%	22.7%	71.0%
2018/19	2763	4.9%	22.4%	49.0%	23.6%	72.6%
2019/20	2620	0.9%	16.1%	53.0%	29.3%	82.3%
2020/21	3077	1.2%	11.3%	49.9%	37.6%	87.5%
2021/22	3044	1.2%	14.5%	51.8%	32.5%	84.3%

Despite the decrease in 2021/22, over the past five years – particularly during 2019/20 and 2020/21 – there has been an upward trend in the number of 1<sup>st</sup> class and 2:1 degrees awarded by the University.

Analysis within the university identifies a number of reasons for this, including changes made during the pandemic to accommodate students. Please see [Section 4](#) for details on the 'Mitigation Packages' the University implemented in 2020/21. It was acknowledged at the time that some mitigations may increase the proportion of higher classifications, in particular the introduction of a safety net policy in 2019/20 and discounting of lowest credit module from classification in 2020/21. By removing the risk that assessments completed during the COVID-19 pandemic could lower a student's year average marks, an upward shift across the cohort was to be expected. This being understood, the main impetus was to deliver fairness for students, therefore the potential consequences were seen as acceptable given the circumstances. In 2021/22 City returned to its standard assessment regulations and policies.

We are actively monitoring the degree classification distributions in our internal Annual Programme Evaluation (APE) process. If concerns are raised, programme level action plans are then drafted and implemented.

Across City, we continue to put in place initiatives to improve our teaching and learning to give our students the best opportunity to succeed on their programme. We continue to diversify our assessment methods whenever possible to require writing, independent research, presentations, analysis, etc. so that all learning styles are accommodated. We are also moving to a blended approach of teaching and assessment, with many assessments now taking place online.

### 3. Degree Awarding Gap

City's Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) student population is its most substantial, accounting for 70.4% of undergraduate graduating students in 2021/22. The degree awarding gap for 1<sup>st</sup> class and 2:1 degrees between White and BAME students varies across City's undergraduate degrees, and in the case of some individual programmes, BAME students perform better than White students, but this is not the case at institutional level. In 2020/21 the awarding gap decreased for the second year in a row from 6% to 3.8% across City. However, in the academic year 2021/22 it rose to 7%. The performance of BAME students mirrors to some extent the overall trend in good honours degree awards over the same period, although the decrease for BAME students in 2021/22 was steeper than for awards overall.

Over the five-year period since 2017/18, and despite the rise in 2021/22, the undergraduate degree awarding gap of 1<sup>st</sup> class and 2:1 degrees awarded between BAME students has reduced across City (see Table 1 below).

**Table 1: Degree awarding gap by Year between White and BAME Students (2017/18 – 2021/22)**

Year	Degree Awarding Gap
2021/22	7%
2020/21	3.8%
2019/20	6%
2018/19	11%
2017/18	11%

In 2021/22 the gap ranged across City's academic Schools from -1% (i.e. BAME students outperformed White students) to 13% (see Table 2 below). This is a much wider range than in the previous academic year.

**Table 2: Degree awarding gap by School between undergraduate White and BAME Students (2021/22)**

School	Degree Awarding Gap
Bayes Business School	7%
City Law School	13%
School of Communication and Creativity	2%
School of Policy and Global Affairs	4%
School of Science and Technology	-1%
School of Health and Psychological Sciences	13%

City is committed to empowering 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 for City.

More information on the Institutional degree classification profile for all undergraduate students for the past five academic years (2017/18 – 2021/22) is set out in [Appendix 1](#).

#### 4. 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](#).

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 Regulation 20](#) and [21](#) respectively. Academic Appeals for validated taught and research programmes are governed by [Senate Regulation 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.

In response to the national lockdowns in December 2020 as a result of the continuing pandemic and the exacerbated the pressure on students, the University convened a new Student Attainment and Assessment Group to consider whether mitigations were required to ensure that students results were not impacted unfairly as a result of the pandemic.

To mitigate the impact of Coronavirus (COVID-19) on students, the Group developed two types of mitigation approaches for students, the '**Main Mitigation Package**' and the '**School-Specific Package**'. These measures were intended to build on the work that was already done in redesigning our programmes, to both support students and to protect their interests by ensuring barrier-free access to learning, fairness of students' results and maintaining the rigour of City's academic standards in line with the Office for Students' expectations.

The '**Main Mitigation Package**' provided support for students in a proportionate manner without compromising on the underlining standards, learning outcomes or overinflating grades. The package which applied to most programmes consisted of the following four points, each of which is intended to target a different aspect of the possible impact on the pandemic on students:

- Relaxed rules on evidence for Extenuating Circumstances claims.
- Ensured Interim Assessment Panels reviewed marks and identified where scaling was required as well as where individual students needed additional support.
- Extended the scope for compensation more widely by increasing the range of compensatable modules where possible.
- Introduced (where relevant) discounting to the lowest credits of modules from that stage's contribution to the final classification.

The '**School-Specific Package**' was designed to meet PSRB requirements or meet the specific nature of the programmes offered by the relevant Schools. These were intended to mitigate specific issues and were considered as the best options for these programmes.

In 2021/22 City returned to its standard assessment regulations and policies.

## 5. 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 the 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:

- Independent scrutiny during the approval of new programmes and the periodic programme reviews.
- Independent scrutiny of assessments and assessment criteria through external examiners. External examiners' reports are responded to by Schools and reported to Senate and its sub-committees via an Annual Report.

## 6. 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 a 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 a PSRB, is available for failed modules in certain circumstances and in accordance with strict criteria to ensure that the learning outcomes of the programme have been met.

## **7. Teaching Practices and Learning Resources**

Our Vision and Strategy 2030 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 and 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.

City continues to review its policies and regulations, including Senate Assessment Regulations, Extenuating Circumstances Policy and Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy to ensure students are fully supported.

## **8. 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 (APE) process, and since 2018/19, through the City Learning and Teaching 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 2021/22 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:

- New in-house and external placements to encourage and support students to find

- short- and long-term work placements and to enhance student employability.
- Participative, interactive, and “inspiring” pedagogy including the positive use of mentoring opportunities.
- Embedding EDI values via changes to inclusivity, diversity and language.
- Positive qualitative student feedback on teaching & learning opportunities.
- Good variety of blended learning approaches with high quality of the online induction and teaching and learning activities.

Ongoing enhancement activities included:

- Implementing additional drop-in tutorials and support sessions, wherever possible and to encourage more student engagement with student-led extra-curricular events.
- Promoting a stronger sense of community and to adjust programmes, wherever possible to do so, to better fit the individual and cohort needs and abilities of all students.
- Addressing issues of contract cheating and collusion encourage academic integrity and to educate and deter students from academic misconduct.
- Ensuring that assessment plans are communicated to students at the start of the academic year.
- Developing and acquiring, where appropriate, more skills-based learning and equipment.

## **9. 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 2017/18 – 2021/22. The Report contains data on degree outcomes broken down by Age, Disability, Ethnicity, Gender and Schools.

			2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
<b>University (All)</b>		<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	22.7%	24.0%	29.3%	37.6%	32.5%
		<b>2:1</b>	48.3%	48.7%	53.0%	49.9%	51.8%
		<b>2:2</b>	23.3%	23.1%	16.1%	11.3%	14.5%
		<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>	5.7%	4.9%	0.9%	1.2%	1.2%
<b>Age</b>	<b>Young (&lt;21)</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	22.8%	23.3%	29.0%	36.8%	32.2%
		<b>2:1</b>	49.3%	49.7%	57.0%	54.6%	54.3%
		<b>2:2</b>	22.9%	23.2%	13.2%	8.3%	13.3%
		<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>	4.9%	3.7%	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%
	<b>Mature (&gt;21)</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	21.8%	27.5%	29.6%	38.3%	32.8%
		<b>2:1</b>	43.4%	43.3%	49.8%	45.4%	49.3%
		<b>2:2</b>	25.1%	22.5%	18.4%	14.1%	15.8%
		<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>	9.7%	6.7%	1.1%	2.1%	2.2%
<b>Disability</b>	<b>No Disability</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	23.0%	23.8%	29.5%	38.0%	32.5%
		<b>2:1</b>	48.3%	49.0%	53.0%	49.7%	52.0%
		<b>2:2</b>	22.9%	23.1%	16.1%	11.0%	14.3%
		<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>	5.8%	4.1%	0.9%	1.2%	1.2%
	<b>Disability</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	17.9%	27.6%	27.6%	33.7%	32.8%
		<b>2:1</b>	48.2%	43.7%	52.6%	51.5%	49.7%
		<b>2:2</b>	28.6%	23.6%	16.3%	13.4%	16.4%
		<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>	5.4%	5.2%	1.0%	1.5%	1.1%
<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>BAME</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	18.5%	21.1%	27.4%	34.7%	29.6%
		<b>2:1</b>	48.7%	48.2%	53.2%	52.4%	53.7%
		<b>2:2</b>	26.1%	25.8%	17.7%	11.6%	15.2%
		<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>	6.7%	4.9%	0.9%	1.3%	1.5%
	<b>White</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	31.9%	32.0%	34.4%	47.8%	43.3%
		<b>2:1</b>	46.4%	48.5%	52.7%	41.4%	45.8%
		<b>2:2</b>	17.4%	17.0%	12.1%	9.4%	11.0%
		<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>	4.3%	2.5%	0.8%	1.3%	0.0%
	<b>Other</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	20.6%	23.9%	22.6%	25.5%	41.5%
		<b>2:1</b>	52.8%	50.3%	53.2%	56.9%	34.1%
		<b>2:2</b>	23.1%	21.8%	21.0%	17.6%	22.0%
		<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>	3.5%	4.0%	3.2%	0.0%	2.4%
<b>Gender</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	20.6%	24.5%	28.4%	35.3%	30.8%
		<b>2:1</b>	49.6%	50.8%	54.9%	50.3%	52.7%
		<b>2:2</b>	23.7%	21.3%	15.1%	12.5%	15.2%
		<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>	3.2%	2.1%	0.8%	2.0%	1.4%
	<b>Male</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	25.3%	23.5%	30.5%	41.2%	35.4%
		<b>2:1</b>	46.7%	45.9%	50.4%	49.4%	50.4%
		<b>2:2</b>	22.7%	25.4%	17.4%	9.4%	13.4%
		<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>	5.2%	5.2%	1.0%	0.0%	0.9%

			2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
<b>Schools</b> Note: Data relates to old School structure in place until 2021/22	<b>School of Health Sciences</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	26.2%	27.9%	33.5%	32.8%	
		<b>2:1</b>	36.6%	43.9%	48.2%	37.7%	
		<b>2:2</b>	23.1%	21.7%	14.7%	20.5%	
		<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>	14.1%	6.5%	2.2%	4.7%	
	<b>City Law School</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	6.4%	7.7%	15.1%	29.7%	
		<b>2:1</b>	51.1%	51.3%	68.1%	59.4%	
		<b>2:2</b>	37.0%	35.2%	16.2%	9.6%	
		<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>	5.5%	5.7%	0.5%	0.2%	
	<b>Bayes Business School</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	26.5%	25.4%	28.7%	33.8%	
		<b>2:1</b>	51.1%	51.1%	50.8%	55.2%	
		<b>2:2</b>	19.8%	21.9%	19.7%	9.8%	
		<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>	2.6%	1.6%	0.3%	0.3%	
	<b>SASS</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	18.5%	22.8%	22.3%	35.1%	
		<b>2:1</b>	58.1%	57.7%	60.6%	55.8%	
		<b>2:2</b>	20.6%	17.4%	16.2%	8.7%	
		<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>	2.8%	2.1%	0.3%	0.1%	
	<b>School of Mathematics, Computer Science and Engineering</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	29.5%	31.9%	47.7%	53.8%	
		<b>2:1</b>	41.5%	34.7%	37.4%	37.0%	
		<b>2:2</b>	22.9%	26.0%	12.1%	7.3%	
		<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>	6.1%	7.4%	1.7%	0.2%	
<b>Schools</b> Note: Data relates to new School structure in place from 2022/23, and has been backdated to 2019/22 for comparative purposes.	<b>School of Health and Psychological Sciences</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>			33.5%	32.7%	31.8%
		<b>2:1</b>			48.2%	46.2%	49.4%
		<b>2:2</b>			14.7%	17.5%	16.0%
		<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>			2.2%	3.6%	2.8%
	<b>City Law School</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>			15.1%	31.0%	23.3%
		<b>2:1</b>			68.1%	59.4%	60.3%
		<b>2:2</b>			16.2%	9.3%	16.4%
		<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>			0.5%	0.3%	0.0%
	<b>Bayes Business School</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>			28.7%	43.2%	34.8%
		<b>2:1</b>			50.8%	50.0%	51.3%
		<b>2:2</b>			19.7%	6.8%	13.0%
		<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>			0.3%	0.0%	0.9%
	<b>School of Communication and Creativity</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>			27.8%	54.1%	38.7%
		<b>2:1</b>			69.4%	43.2%	48.4%
		<b>2:2</b>			2.8%	2.7%	12.9%
		<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	<b>School of Policy and Global Affairs</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>			24.0%	34.5%	33.3%
		<b>2:1</b>			59.0%	56.2%	51.0%
		<b>2:2</b>			16.7%	9.1%	15.2%
		<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>			0.3%	0.2%	0.4%
	<b>School of Science and Technology</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>			47.7%	52.9%	39.1%
		<b>2:1</b>			37.4%	39.2%	49.5%
		<b>2:2</b>			12.1%	8.0%	10.4%
		<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>			1.7%	0.0%	1.1%
<b>IMD Quintiles (Home students)</b> Note: Not all	<b>Q1 (most disadvantaged)</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	18.7%	22.2%	28.6%	35.5%	27.0%
		<b>2:1</b>	45.9%	44.5%	51.4%	49.6%	54.0%
		<b>2:2</b>	27.4%	27.5%	17.3%	12.5%	16.9%
		<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>	8.0%	5.8%	2.0%	2.4%	2.2%
	<b>Q2</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	19.7%	22.3%	30.2%	33.7%	30.1%



			2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
student postcodes are valid thereby do not have a quintile and they were excluded from the calculation.		2:1	50.5%	48.5%	52.8%	50.1%	53.3%
		2:2	22.8%	24.1%	15.4%	15.4%	15.1%
		3 <sup>rd</sup>	7.0%	5.1%	1.2%	0.9%	1.5%
	Q3	1 <sup>st</sup>	23.9%	23.4%	30.5%	38.4%	32.1%
		2:1	44.1%	51.0%	53.6%	50.9%	50.9%
		2:2	27.0%	21.8%	14.6%	10.0%	16.3%
		3 <sup>rd</sup>	5.0%	3.8%	0.5%	0.7%	0.8%
	Q4	1 <sup>st</sup>	23.2%	26.5%	31.0%	42.6%	35.7%
		2:1	48.2%	49.7%	55.8%	50.0%	52.9%
		2:2	24.1%	21.4%	12.2%	6.1%	11.0%
		3 <sup>rd</sup>	4.4%	2.4%	0.3%	1.2%	0.5%
	Q5 (most advantaged)	1 <sup>st</sup>	32.4%	31.0%	36.2%	45.0%	45.6%
		2:1	45.7%	54.0%	49.4%	45.0%	44.0%
2:2		16.0%	12.1%	12.6%	8.0%	9.9%	
3 <sup>rd</sup>		5.9%	2.9%	0.6%	2.0%	0.5%	
Fees (Student fees status)	Home (Home and EU Student Fees)	1 <sup>st</sup>	24.0%	24.9%	31.0%	37.6%	32.5%
		2:1	47.3%	48.0%	53.7%	49.9%	51.8%
		2:2	23.4%	22.5%	13.8%	11.3%	14.5%
		3 <sup>rd</sup>	5.3%	4.6%	0.8%	1.2%	1.2%
	Overseas	1 <sup>st</sup>	19.1%	19.8%	24.7%	34.8%	29.0%
		2:1	51.3%	49.8%	50.8%	54.3%	56.1%
		2:2	25.3%	26.3%	22.7%	10.5%	14.6%
		3 <sup>rd</sup>	4.3%	3.4%	1.1%	0.4%	0.4%
Entry Qualification (Home Students / excludes EU and Overseas) Note: Data relates to the old UCAS tariff in use until 2016/17 entry	No tariff	1 <sup>st</sup>	30.0%	30.9%	25.4%	33.0%	
		2:1	31.4%	36.4%	51.0%	49.4%	
		2:2	25.0%	23.0%	21.8%	13.2%	
		3 <sup>rd</sup>	13.6%	9.7%	0.5%	1.1%	
	Tariff points 10 to 160	1 <sup>st</sup>	0.0%	32.0%	28.2%	36.9%	
		2:1	20.0%	36.0%	57.5%	51.3%	
		2:2	60.0%	28.0%	13.5%	10.4%	
		3 <sup>rd</sup>	20.0%	4.0%	0.5%	1.0%	
	Tariff points 170 to 230	1 <sup>st</sup>	17.6%	0.0%	33.2%	44.1%	
		2:1	52.9%	50.0%	52.6%	47.5%	
		2:2	23.5%	50.0%	13.4%	7.8%	
		3 <sup>rd</sup>	5.9%	0.0%	0.4%	0%	
	Tariff points 240 to 290	1 <sup>st</sup>	13.0%	15.2%	33.8%	40.0%	
		2:1	47.8%	51.5%	43.2%	42.9%	
		2:2	23.9%	27.3%	20.3%	8.6%	
		3 <sup>rd</sup>	15.2%	6.1%	2.7%	2.9%	
	Tariff points 300 to 350	1 <sup>st</sup>	23.9%	24.3%	36.4%	10.5%	
		2:1	46.6%	51.5%	43.0%	42.1%	
		2:2	27.3%	18.4%	16.5%	31.6%	
		3 <sup>rd</sup>	2.3%	5.8%	3.3%	0%	
	Tariff points 360 to 420	1 <sup>st</sup>	31.1%	19.3%	35.4%	37.5%	
		2:1	41.9%	55.7%	42.7%	37.5%	
		2:2	20.3%	18.2%	19.8%	12.5%	
		3 <sup>rd</sup>	6.8%	6.8%	2.1%	0%	
	Tariff points >420	1 <sup>st</sup>	40.8%	42.4%	42.4%	14.3%	
		2:1	28.6%	35.6%	34.8%	35.7%	
		2:2	20.4%	22.0%	14.1%	21.4%	

			2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
		3 <sup>rd</sup>	2.0%	0.0%	5.4%	7.1%	
<b>Entry Qualification (Home Students / excludes EU and Overseas)</b> Note: Data relates to the new UCAS tariff in use from 2017/18 entry	<b>Tariff points 0 to 112</b>	1 <sup>st</sup>			20.1%	35.5%	30.2%
		2:1			63.0%	50.3%	54.5%
		2:2			16.3%	13.4%	13.4%
		3 <sup>rd</sup>			0.5%	0.8%	1.9%
	<b>Tariff points 112 to 156</b>	1 <sup>st</sup>			29.2%	38.8%	34.4%
		2:1			58.8%	51.4%	50.8%
		2:2			11.7%	8.4%	14.4%
		3 <sup>rd</sup>			0.3%	1.5%	0.4%
	<b>Tariff points &gt;156</b>	1 <sup>st</sup>			35.7%	38.0%	33.5%
		2:1			47.2%	45.5%	46.5%
		2:2			15.1%	15.2%	18.5%
		3 <sup>rd</sup>			2.0%	1.3%	1.6%

## Appendix 2: Progress against actions set out in Degree Outcome Statements 2021/22

Commitments made in Degree Outcome Statements:	Progress noted to date:
Enhanced our efforts to address the degree awarding gaps for underrepresented groups, especially Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The degree-awarding gap for 1st class and 2:1 degrees between White and Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic students varies across City's undergraduate degrees. In the case of some individual programmes, BAME students perform better than White students, but this is not the case at institutional level.</li> <li>• In 2021/22, the awarding gap rose to 7%, from 3.8%. This coincides with a fall in good honours awards in the same year, although the decrease for BAME students was steeper than for awards overall.</li> <li>• Over the five-year period since 2017/18, and despite the rise in 2021/22, the undergraduate degree awarding gap of 1st class and 2:1 degrees awarded between BAME and White students has reduced across City.</li> <li>• In 2021/22 the gap ranged from -1% (i.e. BAME students outperformed White students) to 13% across academic Schools.</li> <li>• 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 &amp; Student Strategy.</li> </ul>
City is committed to empowering all students from all backgrounds to achieve their full potential.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Between 2020/21 and 2021/22, the proportion of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2:1 degrees decreased by 3.2 percentage points from 87.5% to 84.3%, following successive increases since 2016/17. Despite this decrease, City remains above the sector average of 78%. <a href="#">Section 2</a> discusses the possible reasons for this trend.</li> </ul>
Our Vision and Strategy 2030 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In November 2022, the new City Vision and Strategy 2030 was published. The Strategy outlines City's values and key strategic themes. The Strategy details the three phases from 2024 – 2030 which will guide City's direction.</li> <li>• From the Vision and the four strategic themes identified within the Strategy, eight strategic pillars were identified. From those pillars, eight Workstreams have been established to lead on and manage the details of the Strategy and Action Plan, including the sequencing, interdependencies and resource requirements to deliver our objectives.</li> <li>• The eight strategic themes are as follows:</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Student Experience</li> <li>○ Education</li> <li>○ International</li> <li>○ Culture (integrating EDI, sustainability and our values)</li> <li>○ Research</li> <li>○ Employability</li> <li>○ People</li> <li>○ Systems, Processes and Infrastructure</li> </ul>
Across City, we continue to put in place initiatives to improve our teaching and learning to give our students the best opportunity to succeed on their programme. Where appropriate, implementing and ensuring the use of varied assessment methods which were supportive and inclusive.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the move away from remote learning to a much more blended learning approach, we continue to diversify our assessment methods so that all learning styles are accommodated.</li> <li>• Additionally, changes have been made to improve educational alignment between programme learning outcomes and assessment methods/content, improve consistency across modules in terms of workload, re-balance weightings of assessment to better reflect student workload burden and to ensure greater transparency to facilitate student workload planning and thus progression.</li> </ul>
Ongoing work to address issues of collusion and poor academic practice and to educate and deter students from academic misconduct.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The University continues to take academic misconduct seriously and seeks at all times to rigorously protect its academic standards.</li> <li>• The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) has recognised in 2021 that academic misconduct is a growing problem within the sector both in the UK and globally.</li> <li>• In light of this serious concern, in June 2021 an Academic Integrity &amp; Misconduct Working Group was formed.</li> <li>• The Academic Integrity &amp; Misconduct Working Group was a medium-term group whose purpose was to identify and implement creative solutions to better embed academic integrity within City, to educate and deter students from academic misconduct and to support staff who are managing these cases.</li> <li>• Actions completed by the Working Group in 2022/23 included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Student communications regarding expectations around academic integrity, responsibilities with a focus on Plagiarism, Collusion and Contract Cheating.</li> <li>○ SU AIM Campaign.</li> <li>○ Staff FAQs.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Minor updates to the Academic Integrity &amp; Misconduct Policy and Guidance to ensure clarity in process and language.</li> <li>○ Dedicated Student Hub Page with resources.</li> <li>○ Dedicated Staff Hub Page with resources.</li> <li>• The Working Group concluded its work in October 2022 and the long-term actions endorsed by Senate will be taken forward by the Quality &amp; Academic Development (QUAD) team and an Academic Transition group led by Learning Enhancement &amp; Development (LEaD) Department which feeds into a larger project on 'Term 1 Readiness' for September 2023, reporting into Student Experience Board.</li> <li>• Additionally, in response to recent technological developments in Artificial Intelligence (AI) Generated Text (such as ChatGPT) the Head of Digital Education is leading work on AI and Chat GPT which will also inform policy and practice on academic integrity and misconduct.</li> </ul>
University initiatives on Student Employability, focused on placement/practice experience and progression.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The implementation of the Career Activation Programme has meant that all UG programmes now have career focus education and professional experience as core elements. This strategy has been in the implementation phase since 2019 and was fully implemented for students starting in 2022/23. Current second and final year students have had access to these modules as electives.</li> </ul>