

ROYAL HOLLOWAY
University of London

**COLLEGE BOARD OF EXAMINERS
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Equal Opportunities; an analysis of undergraduate student performance for cohorts entering the College between 2002 and 2008

Summary

1. This paper examines only some of the possible ways of measuring and monitoring student admission, progression, achievement and withdrawal relative to various equal opportunities factors. Given the available data and staff resources, the methods used and the extent of analysis have to be limited. More detailed statistical information could only be provided by a trained statistician, and on generally larger samples of students than can be provided by a single year's intake at Royal Holloway. For example, multi-variable analysis might be deployed on the performance of white and non-white UK students.
2. This paper also only presents a starting point of the various factors that can be compared against one another. In particular, drilling down to faculty or departmental level has been avoided as far as possible, partly to prevent the amount of information presented from getting out of hand and partly to keep the number of students in the various minority categories at a statistically viable level. Members of the Committee may have a view as to which areas might merit more detailed scrutiny either now, or in a future analysis such as this.
3. There is little evidence of any inequality among students with disabilities or mature entrants (given the relatively small number of such students in the typical intake anyway); this is in line with conclusions made in previous years. There are some inequalities visible between male and female students, particularly failure to progress and withdrawal owing to academic failure which are significantly more likely to occur for male undergraduates. Although some of these inequalities also occur at national level, this may be of concern to College, particularly since they are not reducing over time.
4. Students from outside the EU perform significantly worse than their UK or EU domiciled counterparts. This may well be due to difficulties with language, problems with adjustment to culture or living away from home or to a lower level of prior achievement (which is impossible to quantify as these students nearly all enter with non-standard entry qualifications; this is also an issue with overseas PGT students). However, as such students are predominantly from ethnic minorities, these trends also impact on racial equality and should be monitored; and because the number of overseas students is generally increasing, this will be a growing problem.
5. There is evidence of a gap in performance between home-domiciled white and non-white students, both in terms of final degree classification and progression (particularly from year

1 to year 2). There is some evidence to suggest that this may be mainly due to levels of prior achievement by the two groups of students (since there is an extremely high correlation between entry tariff score and degree performance); however this cannot be definitively proved using the limited methodology deployed, and in any case, tariff scores are only available for students starting in 2006 and before.

Introduction and methodology

6. This paper draws together information on student population, achievement and progression, mainly gathered from data used for the annual review of undergraduate programmes. It seeks to examine trends relating to ethnicity, gender, disability and age; factors which are, or will be, implicated in equal opportunities legislation. Data are also examined relating to students' domicile (or, more accurately, their fee-region- UK, Other EU and Overseas) and their status as 'Widening Participation' students since Equal Opportunities can equally well be held to refer to these factors.
7. Data was used covering seven entry cohorts, 2002 to 2008, allowing for 5 cohorts that are likely to have fully completed their studies (this was also the case in the equivalent analysis in the last two years, CBEEC/07/49 and CBEEC/08/60). Comparison with national data is almost impossible since there is no freely available data relating gender, ethnicity and disability to student progression and achievement. Taught postgraduate students will be analysed in a future report, once the outcomes for the 2008 cohort are known. Benchmark data showing the performance of the student population as a whole with respect to final classification, progression and withdrawal are also presented for reference purposes.
8. Generally speaking, the data are analysed only at the lowest level of a single cohort in the whole College (sometimes all 7 cohorts are combined to give a sufficient sample size to make conclusions meaningful). Some of the analysis is also extended to Faculty level; however note that in general, individual departments/subject areas contain too few minority students in the categories analysed (*eg* non-white, overseas or disabled students) for analysis at this level of detail to have any statistical validity. One could, of course, combine several cohorts, but with the smaller departments, this would still give insufficient students and also such an action removes the possibility to track trends over time. This paper therefore, in the main, discusses general trends in College-wide data and the Committee may wish to decide how best the analysis could be narrowed to individual faculties and departments that may be of particular interest.

Undergraduate student population

9. Fair admissions, which should be part of any equal opportunities analysis, are beyond the scope of this paper since relevant information on applicants (such as declared ethnicity) are not supplied by UCAS- the Banner system only holds such details for current and past students. Analysis in the past has therefore been confined to a brief discussion of the student population, which will at least track general trends in student admissions, even if it is not possible to calculate the actual applications to admissions ratio for students from ethnic minorities, those with disabilities *etc.*
10. Information on home students' social background and entry qualifications is supplied to College by UCAS in the form of an uploadable file, after the students have been admitted to Royal Holloway (hence the lack of information on applicants). Until the 2006 cohort, entry qualifications were supplied in the form of (directly comparable) numerical tariff scores. Unfortunately, from the 2007 entry onwards, entry qualification data is now supplied as a

list of actual qualifications and grades, containing up to 30 lines of data; actual tariff scores are computed by HESA after College reports students to them. Although this gives more actual information (and in most cases, departments make offers to students on the basis of A-level scores rather than tariff points), it does mean that there is no longer a single quantity against which student progress can be measured against prior achievement. Since the students in the 2006 cohort have, in the main, now completed their studies, this is the last of these reports in which tariff scores will be useful. It would be possible to calculate students' tariff scores from the existing information held on Banner, but unless it would be useful in other ways, it is unlikely that the amount of staff time required to perform this task could be justified.

11. The variation in the proportion of the student intake by their declared ethnicity is shown in Fig. 1a (note that throughout this report, 'White' refers to 'White', 'White- British', 'White-Scottish', 'White- Welsh', 'White- Irish' and 'Other White Background'; 'Unknown/Refused' refers to 'Information Refused' or 'Not Known'; 'Non-White' refers to all other responses). After a general slight increase in the number of ethnic-minority entrants up to 2006 (bearing in mind the fairly large number of non-declarers before this point), the proportion had now stabilised at 31-32 %. The number of non-declarers has also gone up in the last 2 entry cohorts; there is no obvious explanation for this. Fig. 1b shows the absolute numbers represented by Fig. 1a and demonstrate the significant increase in UG student intake over the past 4 years.
12. Fig. 1c breaks down entrants by ethnicity further, into Faculties (for clarity, students who failed to disclose their ethnicity have been omitted from this, and all further figures involving declared ethnicity). Intake in the Arts Faculty has been reasonably consistent at 11-17 % non-white over all 7 cohorts; similarly HSS has remained between 41 and 51 % non-white over the same period. The main changes over time have been seen in the Science Faculty where the intake was 70 % white until 2005, followed by a sudden jump down to 60 % thereafter. These data are at least partially a reflection of from where in the world students are coming to RHUL to study (*vide infra*).
13. Fig. 2a shows the distribution of intake of UG students by fee-region. Over the 7 cohorts covered, the proportion of students from EU countries other than the UK has remained remarkably static at *ca* 10 %. There was a steady (if slowing) increase in the proportion of overseas students (at the expense of home students) between 2002 and 2007 from 12 % to 19 %; although this trend was markedly reversed in the most recent cohort. Fig. 2b shows that the absolute number of overseas entrants also fell in 2008, despite the overall increase in intake; by contrast there was a large (*ca* 250) increase in the number of UK entrants. This is likely to be due to the global recession; with overseas students less prepared to pay high fees to study in the UK and home students more likely to study to avoid entering the depressed job market.
14. Fig. 2c further breaks down Fig. 2a by Faculty. Arts and Science have both consistently taken 80-85 % of their intake from the UK over the past 7 years and the remainder close to evenly split from the EU and outside. HSS saw a gradual fall in the proportion of UK entrants from 65 % in 2002 to 50 % in 2007; with a jump back up to 60 % in 2008. Thus, HSS is primarily responsible for the College trend noted above. A significant percentage of College's non-EU population studies in the HSS Faculty.

15. Fig. 3a brings together student ethnicity and fee-region, showing that the non-UK entrants' profile has changed little over 7 years- students from the EU are predominantly white and those from elsewhere mainly non-white. Since 2002, the proportion of UK students from an ethnic minority has increased by nearly 10 %- the net effect on absolute student numbers (Fig. 3b) means that there are now nearly twice as many non-white UK undergraduates than there were in the 2002 intake.
16. Fig. 4 shows the proportion of 'mature' entrants 2002-8 (22 or above when starting their studies, as defined by HESA). This has remained very constant over the past 7 years (and beyond) at *ca* 5-7 %. This can also generally be said of the UG intake's gender balance (Fig. 5) where male students make up *ca* 40 % of the total.
17. Fig. 6a shows percentage of entrants with a declared disability which is again fairly stable over 7 cohorts, only varying between 7 and 10 %. Note that, in general, students are only recorded as disabled if they declare themselves so upon registration. Owing to confidentiality issues, it has often been the case that students who later request special examination arrangements from the Educational Support Office have not had their Banner record retrospectively amended. Fig. 6b show specifically which disabilities have been declared by students (as numerical values). The two categories 'Dyslexia' and 'Specific Learning Difficulty' between them account for the largest number of disabled students in recent cohorts, although the balance between them seems to alter quite significantly- this may be a matter of how students are actually being recorded on Banner rather than variation in the student intake. The number of students with 'Unseen Disability' also seems anomalously high in cohorts 2004 and 2005; although this again may be a data-recording issue. It may even be that some students with dyslexia were recorded in this way in earlier years. It should certainly be noted that population of this field on Banner requires self-declaration by the students themselves.
18. Students can be labelled as 'Widening Participation' under a formula that assesses, among other things, their age on entry, which school they attended and possession of non-standard entry qualifications. The number and percentage of such entrants is shown in Figs. 7a and 7b. The number of such entrants virtually doubled between 2002 and 2006; however the level has plateaued, and since the overall population of College has increased since 2006, the percentage of WP entrants has begun to drop.
19. Most WP-labelled entrants are UK-domiciled. Fig. 7c shows what percentage of home white and non-white entrants fall into the WP category. It can be seen that the percentage of non-white students that are WP has increased faster than that of white students over the 7 cohorts 2002-8. This could indicate that Widening Participation activity has helped increase the number of UK non-white UG students at College (Figs. 3a and 3b). Fig. 7d shows that, proportionally, WP students are more likely to be male than female.
20. Tariff scores are recorded for entrants between 2002 and 2006 (*vide supra*). In this report, they will be used in bands, as shown in Fig. 8, where prior achievement profiles of UK entrants are shown. In general, the overall quality of admissions increased over this period (many fewer students with tariffs below 250 points and more above 350); but the 2005 entry was abnormally good. Now that the 2006 entrants have also mostly completed their studies, the effects of this on achievement will be able to be examined.

21. Although, as previously stated, it is not possible to draw conclusions about the fairness of the College Admissions system from these data, the long-term stability of many factors (*eg* percentage of mature students, students with disabilities and male students) and the general increase in others (WP students, students from ethnic minorities) ought to leave few causes for concern.

Student benchmark data

22. Fig. 9 shows classification profiles for students completing their studies between 2005 and 2009 (the period covered by cohorts 2002 to 2008). In general, this is fairly stable over time and, indeed, the proportion of students failing to achieve a 2(i) or higher has steadily fallen over the past 4 years. As a rule of thumb, 11-13 % of students are awarded a 1st, 52-58 % a 2(i), and 25-29 % a 2(ii). In reference to the abnormally high tariff scores of the 2005 entry, it can be seen that their achievement profile (in 2007-8) is not significantly better than that of the 2006 entry (in 2008-9); although there is not an exact match up between start and finish dates and the presence of overseas students without recorded tariff scores further complicate matters. The link between entry qualifications and achievement will be explored later.
23. Student progression data is represented in the following figures. In previous years, data from all programme stages has been examined; however, that from year 1 has usually been the most informative and that will be the focus of the present report. Fig. 10a plots first year progression against cohort. Students who have yet to attempt the stage (*ie* are at attempt zero) have been omitted for clarity, although this does distort the graph for the 2008 cohort (and to a lesser extent the 2007 cohort) because many students who have yet to be assessed for the first time (either because they are part-time, have interrupted or have deferred) are omitted and may well add to the first-time pass rate once they have sat their examinations.
24. The pass-rate for year 1 over time has, generally, decreased over time (this is the sum of the lower two bars in the chart) and this is particularly noticeable in the first-time pass rate (the lowest bar), although this did increase appreciably in 2008-9. Normally between 5 and 7 % of students withdraw in their first year after making one or more attempts (together with around 2 % who withdraw without making any attempts- these are excluded from the graphs). Figs. 10b-d show similar data for the three faculties individually; one can immediately note that the first year progression rate is significantly higher in Arts than in the other two faculties (between 5 and 10 %) both overall and at the first attempt- and that the gap has been larger in 2007 and 2008 than it has been previously. It should here be noted that students generally enter the Arts Faculty with a significantly higher level of prior achievement than in the other two faculties (Fig. 10e).
25. Figs. 11a and 11b analyse recorded reasons for withdrawal by students (expressed as a percentage of students in that cohort who withdrew); the reasons recorded on Banner have been grouped and paraphrased for clarity. Generally speaking, around 20 % of withdrawn students have failed (although this is lower in the most recent two cohorts where students have had fewer opportunities to fail). There are large numbers of students in the 2003 and 2004 cohorts who have been 'Written off After Time' (which is included under Unknown in the figures) owing to a major tidying-up of historical student records as part of the 2008 HESA return. In more recent cohorts, where it has been easier to classify withdrawn students, the 'Other' category predominates- this includes reasons such as 'No Wish to Study' and 'Personal Reasons'. Most other reasons for withdrawal happen very

infrequently; note that only 94 students have so far withdrawn from the 2008 cohort, so small number effects distort the percentage values here.

Analysis of achievement and progression related to ethnic origin

26. Fig. 12a compares classification profiles for white and non-white students by year of degree completion (ignoring students who failed to declare their ethnicity). As has been noted in previous years, there is a significant gap in achievement between the two groups. In the most recent year, for example, white students were nearly 2 ½ times as likely to be awarded a 1st as their non-white peers and less than 1/3 as likely to fail to achieve a 2(i) or higher. Over the most recent 3 years, the performance of white students has generally improved more than that of non-white students.
27. In order to remove any effects from language problems potentially encountered by overseas students (who are mainly non-white), a similar comparison for UK-domiciled students is shown in Fig. 12b. There is still a performance gap between the two groups, but it is certainly less marked than that which is observed in Fig. 12a and, more encouragingly, the gap has actually generally narrowed in the past few years (although mainly in terms of the percentage of 2(i) degrees awarded- white students are still far more likely than non-white to be awarded 1st class degrees). In the past, this analysis has been repeated at Faculty level, but has been found to be of limited value since the number of minority students in a single faculty in one cohort is fairly small; and combining cohorts prevents tracking of trends over time. This has therefore been omitted on this occasion
28. Fig. 13 shows 1st year progression rates by fee-region and declared ethnicity for all cohorts 2002-8 combined (to ensure sufficient numbers of white overseas and non-white EU students). There is a fairly significant gap, particularly in the 1st-time pass-rate, between white and non-white students from the same fee-region (noting once again that there are relatively few non-white students from the EU and white students from overseas). Even comparing UK-domiciled students, white students have a 10 % higher 1st-time pass rate and a 5 % higher overall pass rate.
29. Concentrating once again on UK students which eliminates some extraneous factors and also gives us enough students in both categories to make statistical sense, we can compare 1st year progression by cohort (Fig. 14). Although the gap between white and non-white students did appear to narrow between 2002 and 2004, it has opened out again to the extent that only 3 in 4 non-white UK students complete their first year at the first attempt (compare 85-90 % for white students). This must surely be of concern even taking into account lower levels of prior achievement among students from ethnic minorities and greater numbers of WP students (see below for further discussion of both of these points). The gap in overall pass rate is rather lower (since non-white students are more likely to progress at attempt 2) but is still noticeable
30. Figs. 15a and b show recorded reasons for withdrawal by declared ethnic origin and cohort. Non-white students are slightly more likely to have withdrawn owing to academic failure than are white students, although the gap has generally narrowed over time (with the exception of the 2006 cohort). Similar trends may be seen by confining the analysis to UK students (Figs. 15c and d). Note that, since these figures are percentages *of students who withdrew*, the actual differences are actually quite small. For instance, in the 2007 cohort, looking at UK students, 1.2 % of white and 1.6 % of non-white students withdrew in year 1 owing to academic failure.

Student performance related to prior achievement

31. As has been noted in previous analyses, it is simplistic merely to compare achievement of UK-domiciled white and non-white students since many factors may influence performance. Things such as social background, language skills (if coming from a household where English is not the first language) may play a part; as will subject of study, since this is not evenly distributed among white and ethnic-minority students and different subjects give different classification profiles. However, one of the most important factors is likely to be prior achievement and this can be analysed in a systematic manner since the tariff score of incoming students is recorded on Banner- this information was supplied by UCAS until the 2006 entry cohort. Tariff scores are generally only recorded where students have A-level qualifications (for instance the International Baccalaureate did not fall under the tariff scheme in 2006, although it has now been included), so this sort of analysis applies only to UK students (which is advantageous since this removes most of the students who do not have English as their first language which may complicate the analysis). The data is reasonably comprehensive for entry cohort 2003 onwards, which means that analysis can be carried out on students who completed between 2006 and 2009.
32. Figs. 17a and b show the distribution of recorded tariff score among white and non-white UK students. These figures are identical to those presented in last year's equivalent report so it is sufficient to note that white students enter RHUL with a significantly higher level of prior achievement than do non-white students.
33. The effect of this prior achievement can be observed in Figs. 17a-d which show classification profiles by (grouped) entry tariff score for students completing in 2009, 2008, 2007 and 2006 respectively (these figures correspond approximately to cohorts 2006, 2005, 2004 and 2003 respectively). These clearly show a strong link between prior achievement and final degree classification (bearing in mind the relatively small number of students in the outside tariff groups). The percentage of students gaining a 1st class or 2(i) degree rises with tariff score (and clearly the percentage of students gaining a 2(ii) degree falls correspondingly).
34. We have seen that UK students from ethnic minorities obtain a poorer final degree classification than their white counterparts, that these students enter with a lower level of prior achievement and that final classification depends strongly on tariff score. It is therefore tempting to write off the first fact as a direct consequence of the other two. Fig. 19a and 19b directly compare white and non-white students in the same tariff score group (combining two classification years in each case to ensure sufficient numbers of students; even with this, there are relatively small numbers in the outside groups). These profiles show that there is much less difference in achievement between white and non-white students than a blind comparison (such as Fig. 12b) might indicate. In particular note the almost identical profiles for students with tariffs between 410 and 500 in both figures and also for students with tariff scores in the range 310-400 in Fig. 18b.
35. It would be overly simplistic to lay the previously observed difference in classification profiles solely at the door of differences in prior achievement. For instance, it is clear that in Figs. 18a and b that there are still some differences between white and non-white students; a generally greater tendency to be awarded a 2(ii) for example. It is also the case that examining only prior achievement is grossly over-simplifying the situation. A Department for Education study in 2007 used multi-variable analysis considering factors such as prior

attainment, age, subject of study, gender, disability, type of HEI, mode of study, socio-economic background; as well as using the degree results of the UK as a whole. Such a study, using many thousands of students and utilising rigorous statistical methods is clearly beyond the resources of RHUL.

36. Figs. 19a-c examine the effect of tariff score on 1st-year progression- once more these figures have been previously presented in a similar study so will not be discussed in great detail. It suffices to say that there is a fairly strong correlation between prior achievement and progressing from stage one of an undergraduate degree, especially at the first attempt (note that the small number of students with tariff scores below 200 does cause some anomalies towards the left-hand end of the scale). Unfortunately, since tariff scores are not available for the more recent two cohorts, this analysis cannot be extended any further into the present than the 2006-7 academic year.
37. This might again indicate that differences in progression rates between white and non-white students (Fig. 14) can be explained away by the difference in prior achievement. Fig. 20 compares directly the two groups (collating the 3 cohorts 2004-6 to increase the number of students in each group). For students with a tariff score above 350 (which is nearly half the students in College), there is indeed no significant difference between white and non-white students (and in the range 310-350, non-white students actually perform better). Here, more than in final degree classification, the College picture can be clearly linked to the long tail of non-white students with a low level of prior achievement (Fig. 16a and b).
38. Figs. 21a and b explore the link between tariff scores and withdrawal reasons. Once more, there is little change in the picture since last year's study- the only difference being that the students starting in 2006 have had their final year (in which relatively few withdraw anyway). Predictably, the percentage of students withdrawing owing to academic failure falls uniformly with increasing prior achievement (Fig. 21a). Comparing white and non-white students in the same tariff brackets (Fig. 21b) is rather inconclusive, unsurprising given the small number of withdrawals in many of the groups.

Student achievement related to gender

39. Classification profiles by gender and classification year are displayed in Fig. 22. There are clear differences between the profiles of male and female students (for instance the former are slightly more likely to be awarded a 1st and significantly more likely to be awarded a 2(ii) than are the latter); however the profiles are reasonably stable over time and are not far removed from the national picture over all HEIs. Male students at RHUL perform very close to national benchmarks and female students slightly better (more 2(i) and fewer 2(ii) degrees).
40. Differences, both at national level and also at RHUL, can partly be explained by different subject areas tending to produce their own distinctive pattern of final degree profiles. Male and female students tend to study different subjects- for example see Fig. 23 which shows distribution of students by gender and faculty at Royal Holloway. The Arts Faculty has a very high (70 % +) preponderance of female students whereas the other two faculties are much more evenly split (given that, overall, males form only *ca* 40 % of the UG student population).
41. Figs. 24a and b compare directly male and female students in the same faculty- the former combines all students who completed between 2005 and 2009, and the latter compares

directly those who finished in 2006 with those who completed in 2009. There is a fair degree of similarity between classification profiles of both genders in the same faculty except for Science, where the male students' tendency to be awarded more 1st and 2(ii) degrees is magnified to a large extent. There is no immediately obvious reason why this should be so- drilling down further to departmental level (not shown since the number of students is relatively small) would seem to indicate that Biological Sciences, Mathematics and, to a lesser extent, Geography make the biggest contribution to the trend.

42. First-year progression by gender and cohort is shown in Fig. 25. Overall, male students are significantly (at least 5 %) less likely to progress to stage 2 at the first attempt; although the difference in overall progression is rather smaller. There has been little improvement in recent cohorts in the difference. Unlike with students from ethnic minorities, this cannot be explained by differences in prior achievement since there are few significant differences between male and female entrants in this regard (although on average, female undergraduates do have a slightly higher tariff score than male students).
43. Figs. 26a and b show a breakdown of withdrawal reasons by gender and cohort. For all cohorts, male students who withdraw are significantly (more than twice) more likely to have done so owing to academic failure than are female students. This is clearly linked to the progression issue noted above and whilst both trends may well be in line with what is found nationally, they may well be areas of concern for College in general.

Student achievement related to declared disability

44. Classification profiles for disabled and non-disabled students are presented in Fig. 27, combining all students classified between 2005 and 2009 since the number of declared disabled students is small (Fig. 6a). There is little difference between the two profiles and it would probably be reasonable to note that disabled students who complete their degree are not disadvantaged compared to their non-disabled peers.
45. Fig. 28 shows progression data for disabled and non-disabled students, again combining all 7 cohorts in the study. The progression rates for all 3 years are slightly lower for the former, although this is mainly 1st-time progression- the overall progression rate is close enough to be within statistical margins of error (given the small numbers of disabled students in each year).
46. It can also be seen (Fig. 29), that disabled students are not significantly more likely to have withdrawn owing to academic failure than are non-disabled students; although they are much more likely to have done so for health reasons.

Student achievement related to age on entry

47. Classification profiles for mature and non-mature entrants, by completion year, are shown in Fig. 30a. There is rather a lot of fluctuation in the former over time, but this is not surprising given the absolute numbers involved (Fig. 30b). It is more profitable to compare the profile for all years combined (Fig. 30c) which reveal differences very similar to that seen between male and female students- mature entrants are less likely to be awarded a 2(i) but more likely to get a 1st, 2(ii) or 3rd.
48. Mature students do have a significantly lower progression rate, especially at first-year level (Fig. 31a); the gap does tend to narrow as students progress through their programmes. A more detailed cohort-on-cohort comparison of 1st-year progression is shown in Fig. 31b;

however the small number of mature students in each cohort means that these data should be approached with appropriate caveats in mind.

49. Although mature students are more likely to withdraw than 'normal' entrants (as is seen in the progression data), there is little difference in the percentage of withdrawals owing to academic failure (Fig. 32), so these students may be failing to complete their studies owing to other factors (perhaps financial or personal).

Achievement related to student domicile (fee-region)

50. Although not specifically an equal-opportunities issue, except that it impacts on racial equality, it is of interest to examine students' performance related to their domicile; more specifically to their fee-region. Figs. 33a and b show classification profiles by fee-region and year of completion which show very little difference between the achievement of UK and other EU students; however students from outside the EU are far less likely to achieve a 2(i) or better than are other students. In 2009, nearly 2/3 of students from outside the EU were awarded a 2(ii) or 3rd class degree. (compared with *ca* 1/5 of other students). Although these students form a relatively small proportion of the College population (Fig. 2a), this is fairly worrying; particularly bearing in mind the general rise in overseas numbers and the high fees paid by such students tending to lead to higher expectations (and thus more appeals when they are not met).
51. The classification profiles by faculty are shown in Fig. 34 (combining students classified in 2005 to 2009). The performance of the non-EU students in Arts is least worrying- but there are very few such students in this faculty anyway. The number of 3rd class degrees awarded to overseas students in Science and the number of 2(ii)s in HSS stand out as the main contributors to the College trend.
52. Fig. 35 shows first year progression rates by fee-region and cohort. These are consistently lower for EU students (compared to home students) and much lower for non-EU entrants. Typically only 70-75 % of the latter progress to year 2 at the first attempt- compare with 85-90 % of UK students. Although success at attempt 2 does narrow the overall progression rate a little, there is still a large performance gap. Levels of prior achievement cannot be used to explain this observation (or the levels of final degree classification) since tariff scores are not generally available for non-UK entrants.
53. Fig. 36 shows reasons for withdrawal by fee-region (with all 7 cohorts combined to ensure sufficient student numbers). There is little difference between UK and EU students in terms of percentage of withdrawals owing to failure; however the rate of failure among non-EU students is much higher (unsurprisingly given the previous observations about progression rates).

Achievement related to Widening Participation Status

54. The number of Widening Participation students in each cohort has been previously mentioned. Fig. 37 shows what sort of final degrees these students obtain set against students who are not designated as WP. There is some year-to-year variation in the WP profiles (which would be expected since this is a relatively small group of students); but overall, apart from a greater tendency of WP students to obtain a 2(ii) degree, the level of achievement does not greatly differ, with the percentage of 1st awarded remarkably similar in each classification year.

55. Fig. 38 compares 1st year progression similarly. Here there is a clear difference, with WP students significantly less likely to progress to year 2 either at attempt 1 or attempt 2. Taking this together with the observation in the previous paragraph, it is possible that WP students may struggle initially but once they have got over the hurdle of year 1, they perform just as well as other students. Certainly, they are only slightly more likely to withdraw owing to failure than other students (Fig. 39).

Andrew J Graham
Academic Development Officer
25 November 2009

Figures




Fig. 1a: Percentage of entrants by declared ethnicity and entry cohort, 2002-2008.




Fig. 1b: Number of entrants by declared ethnicity and entry cohort, 2002-2008.




Fig. 1c: Percentage of entrants by declared ethnicity, Faculty and entry cohort; omitting students who failed to disclose their ethnicity.




Fig. 2a: Percentage of new entrants by fee region and entry cohort, 2002-2008.




Fig. 2b: Number of new entrants by fee region and entry cohort, 2002-2008.




Fig. 2c: Percentage of entrants by fee-region, Faculty and entry cohort, 2002-2008.




Fig. 3a: Percentage of entrants by declared ethnicity, fee-region and entry cohort, 2002-2008. Students who failed to declare their ethnicity are excluded.




Fig. 3b: Figure 3a showing absolute values.




Fig. 4: Percentage of mature and non-mature entrants by cohort, 2002-2008.




Fig. 5: Percentage of female and male entrants by cohort, 2002-2008.




Fig. 6a: Percentage of students with a declared disability by cohort, 2002-2008.




Fig. 6b: Number of disabled students entering 2002-2008, by declared disability.




Fig. 7a: Number of entrants labelled as ‘Widening Participation’ by cohort, 2002-2008.




Fig. 7b: Percentage of entrants labelled as ‘Widening Participation’ by cohort, 2002-2008.




Fig. 7c: Percentage of white and non-white UK-domiciled entrants classified as Widening Participation students by cohort, 2002-2008 (students whose ethnicity is unknown are excluded).




Fig. 7d: Percentage of male and female entrants classified as Widening Participation students by cohort, 2002-2008.




Fig. 8: Percentage of UK-domiciled entrants by (grouped) tariff score and cohort 2002-2006. Percentages are of the total number of home entrants in the cohort with a recorded tariff score.




Fig. 9: Classification profiles for students completing their studies between 2005 and 2009.




Fig. 10a: First-year progression rates by cohort. Students yet to attempt a programme stage are excluded. Note break of scale on y-axis.




Fig. 10b: First-year progression rates by cohort; Faculty of Arts. Students yet to attempt a programme stage are excluded. Note break of scale on y-axis.




Fig. 10c: First-year progression rates by cohort; Faculty of HSS. Students yet to attempt a programme stage are excluded. Note break of scale on y-axis.




Fig. 10d: First-year progression rates by cohort; Faculty of Science. Students yet to attempt a programme stage are excluded. Note break of scale on y-axis.




Fig. 10e: Tariff score groupings by Faculty for the 2005 and 2006 cohorts combined. Percentages are of entrants in that Faculty.




Fig. 11a: Reasons for withdrawal by cohort, 2006-2008, expressed as a percentage of students in that cohort who withdrew.




Fig. 11b: Reasons for withdrawal by cohort, 2003-2005, expressed as a percentage of students in that cohort who withdrew.




Fig. 12a: Classification profiles by year of completion and declared ethnicity. Students who failed to declare their ethnic origin are excluded.




Fig. 12b: Classification profiles by year of completion and declared ethnicity; for UK-domiciled students only. Students who failed to declare their ethnic origin are excluded.




Fig. 13: First-year progression rates by fee-region and declared ethnicity for all cohorts 2002-2008 combined. Students yet to attempt a programme stage, and those who failed to declare their ethnicity are excluded. Note break of scale on y-axis.




Fig. 14: First-year progression rates by cohort, 2002-2008, and declared ethnicity for UK-domiciled students. Students yet to attempt a programme stage, and those who failed to declare their ethnicity, are excluded. Note break of scale on y-axis.




Fig. 15a: Reasons for withdrawal by declared ethnicity and cohort, 2006-2008, expressed as a percentage of students who withdrew in that cohort with that ethnicity. Students who failed to disclose their ethnicity are excluded.




Fig. 15b: Reasons for withdrawal by declared ethnicity and cohort, 2003-2005, expressed as a percentage of students who withdrew in that cohort with that ethnicity. Students who failed to disclose their ethnicity are excluded.




Fig. 15c: Reasons for withdrawal for UK-domiciled students by declared ethnicity and cohort, 2006-2008, expressed as a percentage of students who withdrew in that cohort with that ethnicity. Students who failed to disclose their ethnicity are excluded.




Fig. 15d: Reasons for withdrawal for UK-domiciled students by declared ethnicity and cohort, 2003-2005, expressed as a percentage of students who withdrew in that cohort with that ethnicity. Students who failed to disclose their ethnicity are excluded.




Fig. 16a: Distribution of recorded tariff scores by declared ethnic origin among UK-domiciled students in the 2005 and 2006 cohorts. Percentages are of students in the cohort that ethnic group with a recorded tariff score.




Fig. 16b: Distribution of recorded tariff scores by declared ethnic origin among UK-domiciled students in the 2003 and 2004 cohorts. Percentages are of students in the cohort that ethnic group with a recorded tariff score.




Fig. 17a: Classification profiles by recorded tariff score for UK-domiciled students completing their studies in 2009.




Fig. 17b: Classification profiles by recorded tariff score for UK-domiciled students completing their studies in 2008.




Fig. 17c: Classification profiles by recorded tariff score for UK-domiciled students completing their studies in 2007.




Fig. 17d: Classification profiles by recorded tariff score for UK-domiciled students completing their studies in 2006.




Fig. 18a: Classification profiles by declared ethnic origin and recorded tariff score for UK-domiciled students completing their studies in 2008 and 2009 (combined).




Fig. 18b: Classification profiles by declared ethnic origin and recorded tariff score for UK-domiciled students completing their studies in 2006 and 2007 (combined).




Fig. 19a: First-year progression rates by recorded tariff score for UK-domiciled students in the 2006 cohort. Students yet to attempt the stage are excluded. Note break of scale on the y-axis.




Fig. 19b: First-year progression rates by recorded tariff score for UK-domiciled students in the 2005 cohort. Students yet to attempt the stage are excluded. Note break of scale on the y-axis.




Fig. 19c: First-year progression rates by recorded tariff score for UK-domiciled students in the 2004 cohort. Students yet to attempt the stage are excluded. Note break of scale on the y-axis.




Fig. 20: First-year progression rates by recorded tariff score and declared ethnicity for UK-domiciled students in cohorts 2004, 2005 and 2006 combined. Students yet to attempt a stage are excluded. Note break of scale on the y-axis.




Fig. 21a: Reasons for withdrawal for UK-domiciled students by recorded tariff score in cohorts 2002-2006 combined, expressed as a percentage of students who withdrew in that cohort in that tariff group.




Fig. 21b: Reasons for withdrawal for UK-domiciled students by recorded tariff score and declared ethnicity in cohorts 2002-2006 combined, expressed as a percentage of students who withdrew in that cohort in that tariff and ethnic group. Only middle of tariff score range is shown.




Fig. 22: Classification profiles by classification year and gender.




Fig. 23: Distribution of male and female students by Faculty and classification year.




Fig. 24a: Classification profiles by gender and Faculty for students completing between 2005 and 2009 combined.




Fig. 24b: Classification profiles by gender and Faculty comparing students who completed in 2006 with those who completed in 2009.




Fig. 25: First-year progression data by cohort and gender. Students yet to attempt a stage are excluded. Note break of scale on the y-axis.




Fig. 26a: Reasons for withdrawal by gender and cohort, 2006-2008. Values expressed as a percentage of students of that gender in that cohort who withdrew.




Fig. 26b: Reasons for withdrawal by gender and cohort, 2003-2005. Values expressed as a percentage of students of that gender in that cohort who withdrew.




Fig. 27: Classification profiles for disabled and non-disabled students classified between 2005 and 2009.




Fig. 28: Progression data for first-, second- and third-year students comparing those with a declared disability to those without. Cohorts 2002 to 2008 are combined. Students yet to attempt a programme stage are excluded.




Fig. 29: Reasons for withdrawal by declared disability for cohorts 2002-2008 combined, expressed as a percentage of students in the disability category who withdrew.




Fig. 30a: Classification profiles by age on entry and year of classification.




Fig. 30b: Absolute values represented in Fig. 31a.




Fig. 30c: Overall classification profiles for mature and non-mature students who were classified between 2005 and 2009.




Fig. 31a: Progression data for mature and non-mature students by programme stage for cohorts 2002-2008 combined. Students yet to attempt a programme stage are excluded. Note break of scale on y-axis.




Fig. 31b: First-year progression data by cohort year, comparing mature and non-mature entrants. Students yet to attempt a programme stage are excluded. Note break of scale on the y-axis.




Fig. 32: Reasons for withdrawal for mature vs non-mature entrants for cohorts 2002-2008 combined, expressed as a percentage of students in that age category who withdrew.




Fig. 33a: Classification profiles by fee-region for students completing their studies in 2008 and 2009.




Fig. 33b: Classification profiles by fee-region for students completing their studies in 2005, 2006 and 2007.




Fig. 34: Classification profiled by Faculty and fee-region for all students completing their studies between 2005 and 2009 combined.




Fig. 35: First-year progression data by cohort and fee region. Students yet to attempt the stage are excluded. Note break of scale on the y-axis.




Fig. 36: Reasons for withdrawal by fee region for cohorts 2002-2008 combined, expressed as a percentage of students from that fee region who withdrew.




Fig. 37: Classification profiles for students marked as Widening Participation vs those not so marked for classification years 2004-5 to 2008-9.




Fig. 38: First-year progression data for cohorts 2002-8 comparing students marked as Widening Participation with those not so marked. Students yet to attempt the stage are excluded. Note break on y-axis.




Fig. 39: Reasons for withdrawal by widening participation status for cohorts 2002-2008 combined, expressed as a percentage of students from that WP group who withdrew.